

SOP
M 9836 CO

A

COURSE OF LECTURES

ON

ABSOLUTE ABSTINENCE;

CONTAINING

A REFUTATION OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY,

ADVANCED IN THE

TEMPERANCE VOLUME;

DELIVERED BEFORE HIS CONGREGATION IN OAKVILLE, U. C.

BY THE

REV. ROBERT MURRAY,

PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER, IN CONNECTION WITH THE
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

"In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."—MATTHEW, XV. 9.

"But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all men."—2d TIMOTHY, III. 9.

TORONTO:

PRINTED AT THE BRITISH COLONIST OFFICE.

1839.

555468
17.12.52



RESOLUTIONS

PASSED AT A MEETING OF THE REVEREND ROBERT MURRAY'S
CONGREGATION.

At a Meeting of the Reverend Robert Murray's Congregation, held at Oakville, on the 10th day of February, 1839, Mr. Andrew Wilson, Junior, in the Chair, it was

Moved by Dr. Macpherson, seconded by Mr. Arnott, and unanimously carried:

Resolved 1. That this congregation consider the publication of the course of Lectures on Temperance Societies and Doctrines, which has just been concluded by the Reverend Mr. Murray, would be of general public benefit.

Moved by Dr. Richardson, seconded by Mr. Edward Sanderson, and unanimously carried:

Resolved 2. That the publication of Mr. Murray's Lectures on Temperance Societies, is rendered absolutely necessary in order to confute, and put to silence, the numerous calumnies and false statements which have been most industriously circulated in certain quarters, regarding their scope and tendency, and in order to shew that their real tendency is in the highest degree moral, and correct, and conducive to the best interests of christianity.

Moved by Mr. Urquhart, seconded by Mr. Hopkirk, and unanimously carried:

Resolved 3. That a Committee be appointed to prepare a letter to the Reverend Mr. Murray, in accordance with the foregoing resolutions, and to wait on him with the same, requesting him to permit the publication of these Lectures, and, in the event of his complying with such request, to enter into such arrangements and take such steps for obtaining their publication as they may deem expedient.

Moved by Mr. Tassie, seconded by Captain McCorquodale, and unanimously carried:

Resolved 4. That the following persons do compose said Committee viz:—Dr. McPherson, Mr. Arnott, Dr. Richardson, Mr. Edward Anderson, Mr. Urquhart, Mr. Hopkirk, Mr. Tassie, and Mr. Cameron.

ANDREW WILSON Junior,
Chairman.

LETTER.

TO THE REVEREND ROBERT MURRAY.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

After the conclusion of your Lecture last evening, a meeting of the members of your congregation was held, and a series of resolutions passed, a copy of which I beg to enclose, relative to the publication of the Lectures on the principles and doctrines of Temperance Societies, now concluded, in which Lectures you have so fully established the unscriptural foundation and tendency of these Societies, as at present constituted.

As a general desire exists that these Lectures should be widely circulated, on account of the valuable information and scriptural instruction therein contained, I beg leave, as Chairman of the Committee appointed at the Meeting, to request that, in terms of the above resolutions, you will have the kindness to place these valuable Lectures in the hands of the public, in order that they may judge of the correctness of the principles therein laid down and enforced, and of the falsity of the statements so industriously circulated relative to their tendency.

You will please to observe, that, in terms of the third resolution, a Committee, of which I am Chairman, have been fully authorised to regulate all matters connected with the object now solicited, and, in the event of your consenting to the present application, which I hope you will do, I shall be ready to meet with you, along with the Committee, at any time you may afterwards appoint, for the purpose of entering into the necessary details.

I remain, with much esteem,

Dear Sir,

Yours, most respectfully,

ANDREW WILSON, Junior.

Oakville, 11th February, 1839.

TO
THE MANAGERS, ELDERS, AND MEMBERS,
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATION IN OAKVILLE,
THE FOLLOWING

LECTURES,

IN REFUTATION OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY, AS AT
PRESENT CONSTITUTED,

Are,

With the utmost respect and gratitude,

Inscribed by their

Most dutiful, devoted,

Humble Servant, and

Affectionate Pastor,

ROBERT MURRAY.

P R E F A C E .

In laying the following Lectures before the public, at the request of my Congregation, it appears not out of place to state the motives by which I was led to compose the Lectures, and afterwards to deliver them publicly. Having spent a few months in the City of New York, in the end of 1834 and beginning of 1835, I was struck with astonishment, not more by the mighty efforts which were then making to push forward the temperance scheme, than by the unchristian spirit in which these efforts were made.

In the very capital, as it may be called, of that land of boasted liberty, no man was allowed the exercise of his conscience, or of his own judgment in this matter. The minister of religion, the merchant, and the mechanic, who were not members of the temperance society, were all exposed alike to its undermining and malicious influence, to blast their hopes, to shut up their respective places of public usefulness, and thus to drive them by force, either to seek for refuge under its polluted wing, or to suffer disappointment and ruin in their business.

Induced by such a distorted state of society, and such a system of public persecution, under the pretext of promoting morality and religion, my attention was turned to the subject, and the first four of these Lectures were written there, with the intention of completing the course and delivering them publicly. But I was deterred from doing so, partly by the advice of my friends, to whom I had submitted these Lectures, and partly because the time was at hand which I had fixed for removing to Canada.

The Lectures were then left in an unfinished state, and might probably have remained for ever so, had not the knowledge of the rapid progress of the society, and the wide diffusion of its heretical doctrines; not only in North America, but also in Great Britain, and over the world, led me to the conviction, that I could neither be discharging my duty faithfully to my own people, nor to the church of Christ, if I did not lift up my voice on the walls of the Spiritual Zion, and warn her citizens of the danger which threatened her peace.

PREFACE.

Under these impressions, I struggled long between a sense of duty and a dread of bringing upon my own head the concentrated malice and revilings of the society all over the world. But, lest procrastination, and the fear of man, which bringeth a snare, should finally prevail against me, I fixed their commencement to the period when I should, in the course of my evening lectures through the gospel of Matthew, finish the paragraph ending with the nineteenth verse of the eleventh chapter. It having pleased the Lord to prolong my days till that period arrived, I did commence, and have now finished these Lectures.

From the various and conflicting opinions which have gone abroad, regarding their nature and tendency, my congregation have been led, kindly to solicit their publication, both for the vindication of my own character and for the benefit of others. Under these circumstances, I have been induced to send them to the press precisely as they were delivered from the desk. This may in some measure account for any seeming negligence in the language, as well as for a few expressions, which otherwise might, with advantage, have been changed or softened down, for they were not written with a view to publication.

But one of the most powerful motives which weighed in my mind, to induce me to comply with the request, to lay these Lectures before the public, was, that wiser heads, and hands less occupied with other avocations, might be led to take up the cause of truth, and oppose the further spread of its influence, which is already sapping the foundations of civilized society, and turning away the minds of men from the perfect standards of truth and rectitude, to an implicit confidence in, and obedience to the doctrines and commandments of men. If this great and desirable object shall in any measure be forwarded by these Lectures, their author will be satisfied that his labour has not been in vain.

N. B.—The quotations from the temperance volume are made from the 12mo edition, published by the American Tract Society, without date.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LECTURE I.—Introductory—pointing out the spirit and aim of the Temperance Society, and contrasting them with the Scriptures.....	1
LECTURE II.—Confutation of the Doctrine of the Absolutes, that the manufacturing, or dealing in, or using Alcoholic Liquors, is an immorality, and a violation of the will of God.....	20
LECTURE III.—The same subject continued.....	44
LECTURE IV.—The bearing of the Absolutes' cause on the Christian duty of hospitality.....	66
LECTURE V.—Remarks on the introduction of Alcoholic Liquors—on the future prospects of those who are sober and temperate in the use of them—and showing the Doctrines of the Temperance Society to be a direct insult to the Holy One of Israel.....	83
LECTURE VI.—Showing that the Doctrines of the Temperance Society are a direct insult to the Holy One of Israel.....	105
LECTURE VII.—Pointing out a Society founded on holy principles, and requiring pure and Scriptural Temperance in all its Members.....	128

LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTORY—POINTING OUT THE SPIRIT AND AIM OF THE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY, AND CONTRASTING THEM WITH THE SCRIPTURES.

MY DEAR FRIENDS :

It is but reasonable to suppose that, any one coming before you as I now do, to expose in your presence the absurdities of so favourite, and so extensively supported a scheme as that of temperance societies, must labor under many disadvantages. But an imperious sense of duty compels me to stand forward in the cause of truth, and to lift up my voice for the honour of my Master's character, and for the glory of his cause. I am not ignorant that the course of lectures upon which I am now entering will stir up against me many thousands, who will spare no pains, nor scruple at any means to blast my character, to destroy my usefulness, and, if possible, to crush me to the grave. But with this conviction clearly before me, I shall go down into the valley of combat, and, in the armour of the Lord, contend with this gigantic idol of those who oppose themselves and blaspheme.

You are all aware that a person who is every day watching the growth of a beloved child, or a favourite plant, is not so sensible of its progress, as he is who sees it only at distant intervals. In like manner Temperance Societies having grown up, as it were, under your own fostering hand and daily inspection, it is only by comparing them with what they were in years which are gone, that you can measure their progress. But coming as I did, from a land where the Temperance Society was still a feeble plant, and finding as I did, that on this continent it was like a mighty oak; whose shadow fills the whole land,

you cannot be surprised that it was one of the very first objects which arrested my attention. I saw its influence, and wished to take shelter under its shadow.

With this view I went to the proper quarter to make more special and minute inquiry into the rules and requirements of the Society. I was then and there informed that the Society had no printed regulations, and that its requirements were simply to sign the pledge to abstain from alcoholic liquors. I was struck with the fact, that a Society whose members fill the land in its length and breadth, had no articles whatever. After this I procured the Temperance volume, containing the standard Temperance Tracts, all which I have studied with much care, and much anxiety, as also many other productions on the same subject of still later date.

It is the result of this study, my friends, which I now beg leave to submit to you, and I trust when you have heard me to the end of my intended course of Lectures, that your eyes will be opened to see the darkness which this Society is spreading like sackcloth over your religious atmosphere. That you will be emboldened, like so many Samsons, to bend all your strength against the pillars which support this temple of Dagon, until it tumble to ruins; and that your minds will be enlightened, and your hearts encouraged to rear upon its ruins a more rational, more efficient, and more durable society, by the operations of which you may reasonably calculate that intemperance shall be banished, at least, from the busy haunts of men. If I shall succeed in convincing you of the absurdity, and pernicious tendency of the Temperance Society, as it is at present established, I will devote one Lecture to the pointing out of what I conceive to be a rational and effectual plan to stem throughout the world the tide of intemperance.

I have no hesitation, my friends, nay, it gives me much pleasure to be able to state openly before you, that I have ever been

an advocate for temperance in all things, in the sense in which that phrase is applied in Scripture. I have even withdrawn myself from the society of some of my most influential friends, when I found it could not be enjoyed without violating this precept, and have thus voluntarily sacrificed worldly interest to what I considered to be my duty as a christian. For a similar reason no power on earth shall ever prevail on me to support the Temperance Societies as they are at present constituted, for they do appear to me—and I do not despair of being able to make them appear to you—more pernicious in their tendency than the very evil which they are intended to remedy.

I doubt not that there are at this moment many mourning that a professed ambassador for Christ should, *in the temperate language of the Temperance volume*, thus lend his influence to destroy, both for time and eternity, unborn millions of our race. I doubt not they are at this moment preparing to try the presumptuous offender, in their usual way, by holding him up to the withering influence of public odium; for they consider membership with them as absolutely necessary now, in order even to acquire any respectable status in society. But they may, if they choose, save themselves of this trouble, for the offender holds that society cheap indeed, where admission is granted only on such conditions. But let them persecute, for the offender also knows, that all who live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution. Besides, it will show to the world what spirit they are of. I am aware the Society will brand me with the epithet of a canting hypocrite, for presuming to try their beloved scheme by the test of Scripture. I am also aware many able divines support the cause, yet still it does appear to me unscriptural; and the only apology for clergymen giving their names to the temperance pledge appears to be, either that they have been forced into it by the almost resistless

tide of popular opinion, or that they have joined it unsuspecting of its tendency. But you will readily perceive that neither of these are valid apologies, if the tendency of the Society is evil, for they are the watchmen on the walls of the spiritual Zion, and are bound to give the alarm when Zion's interests are in danger; they should therefore never be found sleeping at their post.

Every merchant is aware that it would be perfect folly to send goods to a foreign market, and to attempt to pass them at the custom house there, while he knows that by the laws of the country they are held contraband, and must be confiscated as soon as they arrive. Every lawyer knows that it is absolutely necessary for a judge to hear both sides of a case before he can in the decision, do justice between man and man. Every physician is aware that there are many cases in which a cure cannot be effected, without taking into his calculation the remote as well as the proximate cause of the disease. Every divine knows that the more opposition the truth meets with, the more glorious it appears.

If, then, it shall appear that the members of this society are attempting to force men into heaven, contrary to the established and immutable laws of heaven, will not the merchant say that this is folly? If it shall appear that this Society have only laid one side of the case before the public, and that too very imperfectly, will not the lawyer say at once that the public cannot give a clear decision on its merits? If it is found that this Society have been attempting to cure a great moral disease, by attending to the proximate cause, without taking into account the remote cause, will not the physician say that it is possible they may not only fail in effecting a cure, but even aggravate the disease? If it is found that the efforts of this Society are founded on eternal truth, the

word of God, will not the divine rejoice to have it fairly confronted with that standard ?

But, if it is found that this Society have been teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, let them not hesitate to change their plan of attack against the common enemy. And if it is found that an extension of the principles of this Society would subvert all human society, and extirpate the human race, will it not be considered a dangerous measure, and unworthy of further support ? And if it is discovered that its most zealous advocates have either ignorantly, or wilfully misrepresented the word of God to support the cause, will it still be considered necessary to uphold it at such an expense ? And if it is found that many of the arguments by which it is supported, are direct reflections against the character and conduct of the Saviour, and if some of these arguments come within the sphere of blasphemy, will you still believe that there is no reason to stop and reflect, before pushing farther your favorite scheme at such hazards ? And since it appears to me to involve all these consequences, may I not hope that you will suspend your judgment on my non-conformance, till I have stated my objections fully, and until they have been removed satisfactorily.

My first objection to this Society, is that it is not correctly designated by the name of Temperance Society. (a)*

At first sight this may appear an objection of very little importance, but it is not so. It is evident that the use of language is to convey ideas. But if we make use of language to convey ideas, contrary to what by common consent it really does, then are we using language dishonestly.

Let me ask you, then, where, amid all the volumes ever written in the English language, previous to the organization

* See Appendix.

of the Temperance Society, do you find the word temperance used as synonymous with absolute abstinence? It never was so used. Why, then, was this society designated a temperance Society, and not at once an Absolute Abstinence Society?—The reason is evident, although intentionally concealed from the world. Had this society been properly named there could not have been found a single text in the whole inspired volume to support its claims, without perverting its meaning. The authors of this society must have known this fact, and therefore passed it upon the world under false colours. The name Temperance was evidently adopted as a foil to deceive, or as a bait to entice the unsuspecting into the snare. The founders of this society were perfectly aware that no man, who wished to stand respected as a christian, could bear the idea of being branded as intemperate, or as a drunkard. This name, and nothing else gave it an appearance of plausibility, and enabled its advocates to use, or rather to abuse, many texts of scripture in support of their scheme. But I put the members of the temperance society, (or the ABSOLUTES, as I shall henceforward, for the sake of brevity, denominate them) —I say, that I put the Absolutes to defiance, individually and collectively, to point out one single text of scripture from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation, in support of absolute abstinence from alcoholic liquors, unless they absolutely pervert its meaning. The words temperance and temperate, are not used any where in the old Testament. But in the new Testament, each of these words is used in three different passages, and certainly in none of them does it allude in the most distant manner to absolute abstinence. I shall quote these passages: Acts xxiv. 25—“And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled.” 1st Cor. ix. 24, 25—“Know ye not that they which run in a race, run all, but one receiveth the prize? So

run that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things." It is evident that temperate here, which has been so much talked of by the Absolutes, does not mean absolute abstinence in all things. Besides, the apostle is only describing the practice of the heathen youth in training for their public games, and not expressly laying down a rule for christians. Gal. v. 22, 23—"But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, against such there is no law." Titus i. 7, 8—"For a Bishop must be blameless as the steward of God ; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre. But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate." Titus ii. 1, 2—"But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine, that the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience." 2d Peter i. 5, 6, 7—"Add to your faith, virtue ; and to virtue, knowledge ; and to knowledge, temperance ; and to temperance, patience ; and to patience, godliness ; and to godliness, brotherly kindness ; and to brotherly kindness, charity." The apostle here evidently refers to the fruits of the spirit, as Paul does in Gal. v. 22. —In Titus i. 7, 8. Paul, in his qualifications of a Bishop, says, they should not be given to wine, and that they should be temperate. From this it is evident, that the apostle understands temperate here, as a fruit of the Spirit, and not at all to drinking moderately, otherwise he would not have given a separate, distinct, direction on this head. From these quotations it appears evident, that temperance, and temperate, are not in one single instance applied in scripture to drinking, unless it be in reference to the candidates for the prize in the games as quoted above. At all events, they have not the most remote shadow of application to absolute abstinence.

Now, let us apply Temperance, in the sense of ab-

solute abstinence, to other things besides drinking, and see to what absurdities it would lead us. We are to be temperate in eating as well as drinking ; that is, we are to eat none at all. We are to be temperate in the use of language ; that is, we are to speak none at all. We are to be temperate in the use of clothing ; that is, we are to use none at all. Who will say this is not fair reasoning on the acceptation of temperance adopted by the absolutes ? But, perhaps, it may be said, that the use of intoxicating liquors is one of the vices which leads to everlasting destruction. I grant the abuse of it leads to this result, but not the use. In reply to this we are told, in the temperance volume, that all use of alcoholic liquors is an abuse. Let us apply this again to those things which are mentioned in scripture as leading also to destruction. Is it not said that the covetous shall not inherit the kingdom of Heaven ? To avoid this evil, we must, on the temperance principle, shake ourselves free from all concern about the world. Is it not said that extortioners shall not inherit the kingdom of Heaven ? To avoid this evil, we must lay aside for ever, all mercantile transactions. Do not fleshly lusts war against the soul ? Are not adultery, and fornication classed along with drunkenness, as to their effects ? Because these things lead to such consequences, why not enforce absolute abstinence, to prevent danger from this source ? (b) Paul says, " it is good for a man not to touch a woman." It is well known Paul was not married, and when speaking of marriage he says—" I would that all men were even as I myself. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I. Art thou loosed from a wife, seek not a wife." In the language of the temperance volume, does not this union fill our poor houses, and our jails, and supply all the victims who go down to destruction ? Are not these sufficient scripture authorities, for enforcing here the no-

Gospel, x. 5, 6, 7, 8, he says, "And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it, if not, it shall return to you again. And in the same house remain eating and drinking such things as they give. And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as they set before you." Now, I leave you to judge, if any two commandments can possibly be more directly opposed than these two. We cannot be christians, if we do not obey the commandments of Christ, and we cannot belong to the Absolutes, without conforming to their rules, and as it is a moral impossibility to do both, it remains with you to choose which you will obey, God, or man.

In the *Well Conducted Farm*, p. 3, it is written, "My Maker does not require of me any more than I can do without rum, for he used no ardent spirits himself, and I shall require no more of them." I shall make one remark on this passage in passing, namely, is not alcohol ardent spirit? and did Christ not use alcohol? He used wine without any scruple; and many kinds of wine contain half as much alcohol as proof spirits do—it is, therefore, evident that the Saviour did use alcohol, or ardent spirits. Either the Holy Bible, or the T. B. is teaching falsehoods—which of the two is wrong, I leave to your own decision.

In the *T. B. Effects of Ardent Spirits*, page 18, it is written, "And there is no other way given, under Heaven, whereby men can be saved from the vice of intemperance, but that of total abstinence." You see this is still the same doctrine. You must also observe that there is here an unwarrantable liberty taken with one of the most solemn passages in scripture. The sentence was intended by the

Apostle to exalt the character of the Redeemer, but it is here a direct reflection upon his character, something more than an insinuation that he left no proper precept to guard men against the sin of drunkenness. My friends, this is not drawing an inference, for it follows as a natural consequence, or corollary, from the statement here made. And whether this is dishonouring the Saviour, I leave you to judge. God left the use of alcoholic drink to our own discretion, as he did all our other enjoyments, telling us at the same time, if we become drunkards, he would banish us for ever from his presence. And is this not sufficient to deter every christian from the vice of intemperance. In the T. B. Appeal to American Youth, it is written in page 7, "A short time since the infection had become almost universal, but God, in his great mercy, has inspired his servants to publish the only remedy, abstinence, total abstinence, for ever." You see here the same doctrine of absolute abstinence. But there is something here, perhaps, still more important. The publishers of this doctrine of absolute abstinence lay claim to the honour of being God's servants, but it appears, as if their title to that honour was very doubtful. We have seen that some of the commandments of the absolutes are directly opposite to the commandments of Christ. But Christ has said, John xiv. 15, 21, 24, "if ye love me, keep my commandments. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings." And John xv. 14, "Ye are my friends; if ye do whatsoever I command you." In this verse the Saviour substitutes the appellation of friends, for servants, and in next verse he explains the reason why he does so. You have already seen that the absolutes directly contradict the commandments of God—are they then the servants of God?

In T. B. Putnam and the Wolf, or Monster Destroyed, page 14, it is written, "He only that entirely abstains is temperate." The same doctrine is taught here also. But we have here something of more importance. We have a key to explain many of the dark sayings of the absolutes. Nothing is more common than to hear the members of this sect saying, coolly and deliberately, that such and such another man or woman is not temperate. But intemperance in their acceptation is no disgrace, and no sin, although they do not mean it so. No christian would bear to hear an infidel branding the Lord Jesus Christ as intemperate, and consequently immoral. But you can not surely bear with more patience to hear a Rev. Gentleman say so. If there is any meaning in language, the sentence last quoted, includes all the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, in the list of the intemperate and immoral, with him who is in the scriptures denominated the Lord God of the holy Prophets at their head, for none of all these entirely abstained from alcoholic liquors. Can you lend the influence of your name, or having lent it already through ignorance, will you allow it to continue to prop up such a heresy as this, that the Lord Jesus Christ was an intemperate and immoral man.

In T. B. Scripture Arguments for Temperance, it is written, page 5, "All agree that total abstinence is the only hope of the drunkard. But is it not preposterous to expect him to abstain if he see the Minister, the Elder, the Deacon, and other respectable men indulging their cups." The Rev. author of this treatise, you perceive, teaches the same doctrine of absolute abstinence. But let us look at the tendency of his arguments. Suppose Ministers, Elders, and Deacons, should give up their cups, in order to set a good example to some worthless character in the circle of their

influence, is it probable that he would follow their example. Again, another man is a profane swearer. taking the name of his God in vain Is it not preposterous to expect him to give up this abominable practice, while he hears the Minister, Elders, and Deacons, making use of the same name so frequently ; in order to reclaim him, therefore, they must give up using that holy name altogether. Another man may be an extortioner ; and is it not preposterous to expect that he will abandon this vice, so long as he sees the Minister, the Elders, and the Deacons, all careful to make a little independence justly.

From these quotations, the object which this society has in view, and the means by which they wish to accomplish it must be obvious to you all. There appears, when reading this volume, to be something like a want of decision among its writers. Some prohibit all intoxicating drink, and others, it would appear only prohibit ardent spirits. But as alcohol is the great enemy they all wish to banish, I shall confine my remarks to alcohol alone, and that under every disguise, as it is evident whatever contains alcohol will produce intoxication. This is also the view now generally taken and acted upon by the absolutes, and without this they cannot be consistent. For with what reason could any man urge his poor neighbour to lay aside his spirits and water, while he himself is using a like or even a greater quantity of alcohol in the shape of wine, or cider, or beer, or porter, or meed, &c. The absolutes have compassed sea and land to make proselytes to their doctrines; so also did the Pharisees to make proselytes to the traditions of the elders; but did they thereby make them better men? Certainly not; for the Saviour, who knew the hearts of all men, says expressly, that they made them ten-fold more the children of hell than

ble scheme of the absolutes? For saving many millions of dollars annually, and for preventing unborn millions from going down to hell! There is no such authority in scripture for absolute abstinence from intoxicating liquors, as this is, to abstain from the marriage union. O! to what absurdities men will really allow themselves to run, when they study only the phrases in God's word, which make for their purpose, without any regard to their local signification? Notwithstanding these quotations, Paul encouraged marriages, and only discouraged them for a time, while the church was distracted with persecutions. The more we study our Bibles, the less liable are we to be imposed upon by the advocates of fanciful theories; from whose tender mercies we have little to hope. Since God created man upon the face of the earth, there never was a more downright absurdity imposed upon, and supported by any enlightened, and civilized people, than that of absolute abstinence from all intoxicating liquors.

I shall now proceed to the examination of some of the principal arguments made use of by the absolutes, to support their favourite theory, which, by the way, often appears too heated and intemperate to redound much to their credit. Is there not such a thing as intemperance in the use of language, as well as in the use of alcoholic liquors? If there is, can the absolutes plead innocent in this respect? I presume I might challenge the world to produce any parallel in print, to the intemperate ravings which have been published in support of this cause; and surely no good cause can ever require such support. The arguments which I intend to refute shall be taken from the Temperance volume, which I cannot help remarking is a strange book in many respects; but in none more strikingly so, than in the intemperance of its language, and the decided preference which it gives to theory, over truth. Were

I not called upon as an Ambassador for Christ, to vindicate his honour; no worldly consideration could have induced me to lift my voice publicly in refutation of this scheme. More especially when I found it fenced round like the Mosaic ritual of old, with woes and curses. Temperance Vol Scripture Arguments for Temperance, page 16, it is written, Woe to that man who at this crisis shall knowingly encourage the exciting cause of such evils, [that is of drunkenness]—And heaviest woe to him, who shall avail himself of a standing in the Church for this purpose. I hear for such, a loud remonstrance from countless millions yet unborn, and a louder still from the throne of eternal justice, and from the lips of the compassionate Saviour, and if they heed not the voice of infinite love, I see for them, “the wine of the wrath of God poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation.” Again, in Putnam and the Wolf, or Monster Destroyed, page 10, it is said, “Next comes canting hypocrisy, with his Bible in his hand, telling us that every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving. What does he mean? That ardent spirits are the gift of God? Pray, in what stream of his bounty, from what mountain and hill does it flow down to man?” Who would dare to be under the curse of God, or to drink of the awful cup here represented, or what christian would be willing to be thought a canting hypocrite? But these things, in the present instance, have no terrors for me; I know that the curse causeless will not come, for the Lord has said so. I know also that all who would live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution, for the scriptures have said so. But if a man is to be called a canting hypocrite, who takes his Bible in his hand as the rule of his life, and his counsellor in difficulties, I covet such an honour, as the highest earthly distinction. Such language as the

above is only fit for scoffers and infidels, and awfully uncomely in the lips of a christian minister. The opinion of the Pomfret hero I hold in utter contempt ; Christ is my hero, and while I plead his cause I shall take the Bible open in my hand. I have strong suspicions of any cause which requires to be supported by sealing up the Bible. By sealing up the Bible, the Roman Pontiffs built up the vast fabric of their mighty superstition, which still stands as a powerful barrier in the way of Christ's kingdom. This superstition, like the oak, was gathering strength with age ; but no sooner was the Bible opened, than it was riven to the foundation, like the oak when shivered by the electric bolt of heaven.

Is it really so that history must tell to generations yet unborn, that near the middle of the nineteenth century, a scheme was hatched and propagated, and extensively patronized by the Protestants in America, for promoting morality and virtue with sealed Bibles ! Although many in the United States do look upon it as a national honour that such a scheme had its origin there ; yet, as certainly as truth must finally triumph over falsehood, and the doctrines of the gospel over heresies, so certainly shall the time arrive, when the memory of this very scheme shall be retorted upon the Americans as a national disgrace. Oh, happy would it be for the honour of the United States, if they could, at any expense, collect all the books and tracts which have been published there on this subject, and burn them publicly, as the Ephesian converts did their books of magic. We have seen that the Temperance Volume contains heavy curses against the man who shall presume to oppose the absolutes in carrying out their plan. Notwithstanding this, I shall now open the Bible, even at the risk of being called a canting hypocrite, and set before you the light of God's word on this subject,

so that you may see and understand to judge correctly of its merits.

Many who have signed the temperance pledge, may not be fully aware of the spirit of the society with which they have connected themselves. I shall therefore quote their doctrines, from their own acknowledged standards contained in the temperance volume, and from no other authority, as any other might be considered spurious. For it would not, indeed, be dealing honestly with the society to make them responsible for every production of all their members. But the different writers, in this volume, have all had their works examined by the society, and approved of as canonical. This volume, therefore, may, with propriety, be called the Temperance Bible, and by its doctrines they must stand or fall. In Peter and John Hay, Temperance Bible, page 11, it is thus written, "Your only safety is in total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks." This is certainly a plain prohibition of all liquors containing alcohol. Whoever, then, has put his name to the temperance pledge, and uses alcoholic drink in any shape or quantity, is sinning against this plain doctrine of the T. B. This doctrine is not mentioned in one solitary instance only, but runs through the whole volume. In the Rewards of Drunkenness, p. 4, it is written, "separate yourself then utterly from this ensnaring sin. Touch not, taste not, handle not. In entire abstinence is your only safety. This persevered in, you shall never fall. Wherever, and however, the temptation is presented, avoid it, turn from it, and pass away." This is evidently the same doctrine. But this last sentence is deserving of our notice in another point of view. In our Saviour's instructions to his seventy apostles, whom he sent before his face to preach the gospel in every city : Luke's

themselves. The only text found in the whole inspired volume which affords any countenance whatever to the absolutes, and which is continually in their mouths, is in Romans, xiv. 21, which says, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth or is made weak." It appears scarcely possible that any man, even of ordinary capacity, can read the chapter of which this verse forms a part, and for one moment believe that it gives any countenance whatever to the scheme of the absolutes. On the contrary, it is a direct and positive condemnation of their favourite scheme. In the second epistle of Peter, iii, 16, he says, "In Paul's epistles are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." In Rome, at the time Paul wrote this epistle, there were people from all nations of the world, many of whom must have retained their natural prejudices against particular kinds of food. It is evident from this chapter, as well as from other places of the New Testament, that christians were not restricted to the use of any particular kind of food ; for the apostle here says, "One believeth that he may eat all things, another who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not ; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth ; for God hath received him. I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself. All things indeed are pure, but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence." Now, is it at all surprising, that the christian liberty, of eating all kinds of food, should have given offence to some of the converts to christianity. It is well known to every one, at all acquainted with the early history of the church, that christians, of every rank in society, lived in habits of the most

intimate and social intercourse. Men of all nations, who, previous to their conversion, had belonged to all the varying shades of idol worship and Gentile superstition, met under the same roof, and sat down to the same repast. It is not therefore any matter of surprise, that many of them should retain their special prejudices against particular kinds of food, even after their conversion to christianity. Thus, for instance, a Jew being converted to christianity, could not all at once believe, that he might with impunity eat swine's flesh, which from his infancy he had been taught to look upon as an unclean thing. The Egyptian, on the other hand, could not all at once be convinced that he was at liberty to eat the flesh of sheep, the use of which he had been taught to look upon as an abomination. Many of the Roman citizens, on the contrary, were in the habit of using these things without any scruple of conscience. Now, when men under the influence of these and similar early prejudices, came to eat at the same table, and to look upon each other as members of the same society, it is not surprising, that while some were eating, what others held as unclean, uneasy feelings on this subject should have existed in the church. To have continued to outrage the feelings of new converts to christianity, by insulting all their preconceived opinions regarding meats, must have deterred many from becoming members, and thus have retarded the progress of the gospel. The whole scope therefore of the apostle's argument amounts to this, that Christians were not to judge one another regarding meats. And although he himself had been taught by the Lord Jesus, that there was nothing unclean, still as a matter of christian charity he enjoined it upon those who were of the same faith, that they should not wound the feelings of new converts whose faith was still weak, by indulging in their presence,⁵ in the use of those meats, which

in their unconverted state they had held as unlawful, and from the power of early associations still regarded as unclean. The apostle, like a faithful servant, labours to remove every obstacle in the way of securing converts to christianity. He stood in the door of the church, and proclaimed a hearty welcome to all who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, even although labouring under many errors in other matters,—for it is evident he considered their objections to using meats as an error, and a proof of the weakness of their faith. This appears quite opposite to the conduct of our modern absolutes. They stand in the door of the church, and say to all who would enter, unless you pledge yourselves to absolute abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, you cannot enter here, depart you unclean. In vain do they plead their belief in Christ; in vain do they argue that stimulating drink is permitted in the Bible; in vain do they plead that they consider the use of these things consistent with true christianity; the door is still shut, nay, hermetically sealed against them, so long as they are non-conformists to this new test; this gigantic idol of man's creation, at whose shrine they have sacrificed the word of God, the interests of the church, and the honour of the Saviour. Are they not aware that they are acting in direct contradiction to the spirit of that very passage of scripture upon which they build their authority? Are they not aware that they are giving offence to many of the most devoted and most sincere followers of the Lamb of God? Are they not aware that they are shutting up the kingdom of heaven against men, neither going in themselves, nor suffering them that are entering to go in? Are they not aware that all this mighty effort, by which they are turning the world upside down, might succeed even beyond the hopes of its most sanguine devotees, and yet not add one convert to the

church of Christ, nor bring one soul to heaven? It is literally spending labour for that which profiteth not.

LECTURE II.

CONFUTATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ABSOLUTES, THAT THE MANUFACTURING, OR DEALING IN, OR USING ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS, IS AN IMMORALITY AND A VIOLATION OF THE WILL OF GOD.

Having thus far shown that the T. B. plainly teaches the doctrine of absolute abstinence from all intoxicating liquors, I shall next direct your attention to what is there taught regarding the immorality of manufacturing, dealing in, and using alcoholic liquors. This is the strong hold of the Society, and unless we can force them out of this encampment, there is no hope of victory. Here, then, is the disputed ground. If we cannot vanquish the absolutes at this very point, they must of necessity vanquish us, and we must submit for life to their chains and slavery.

My dear Friends, I now look upon you in the light of a jury; and I therefore do expect that you will pay particular attention to the whole argument, so that you may be prepared to give your decision unhesitatingly on this point, which appears awfully important, both to the cause of religion and the interests of society. I shall now subjoin a few quotations from the T. B. to show that they hold the doctrine, that the use of Alcoholic liquors is an immorality, a violation of the will of God:

“Traffic in Ardent Spirits,” p. 1, it is said, “To use ardent spirits is an immorality; it is a violation of the will of God.”

“Effects of Ardent Spirits,” page 18, “The parent should no more suffer his children to drink a little than he does to lie a little, and to steal a little.”

“Appeal to American Youth on Temperance,” page 4, “If while under conviction, a person allows himself to sip a little, he is sure to grieve away the Spirit of God. For unless heaven and hell can work together, God cannot consistently send his Spirit to co-operate with the spirit which Satan employs more than any other agent, in fitting men for his service and kingdom; for what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? and how can two walk together except they be agreed? if then ye know these things, and desire salvation, O beware of sinning against the Holy Ghost.”

“Alarm to Distillers,” page 6, “If endless exclusion from heaven is the drunkard’s doom, can he be held guiltless who deliberately prepared for him, and perhaps placed in his hand, the cup of death and damnation? Wilfully persevering to furnish the sure means of death, you carry to the judgment the murderer’s character, as clearly as the midnight assassin.” Page 7, “It seems hardly needful to say that the foregoing considerations are all strictly applicable to such as furnish the materials for the distiller.” Page 8, “Nor is the crime of the retailer of ardent spirits essentially different. Indeed, the retailer, the distiller, and he who furnishes the materials, must be looked upon as forming a triple league, dangerous alike to private and social happiness, and to the very liberties of the nation.”

“Putnam and the Wolf, or the Monster destroyed,” page 19, “Listen not to those who say you are carrying matters too far; but depend upon it their pleas are only those of debased appetite and avarice. The use of ardent spirit meets no support in the Bible or the conscience, and the traffic meets none,” Page 20, “Have you supported this cruel kingdom of darkness and death? Will you do it longer? Shall conscience be riven by the act? Shall the land that bears you be cursed? the young around you be sporting with hell? the awakened sinner be drowning conviction at his bottle? Shall God be grieved? Shall the wailings from the bottomless pit hereafter reproach and agonize you as the cause of the ruin perhaps of your children and children’s children?”

“Arguments against Ardent Spirits,” page 20, “What! can it be that a real christian should at this day be concerned in the manufactory of ardent spirits for general use? When I think of the light that now illuminates every man’s path on this subject so clearly, and think how the horrors of Intemperance must flash in his face at every step, I confess I feel disposed indignantly to reply—No, this man cannot be a christian.” Page 22, “Ardent Spirits were not known till many centuries after Christ; not a word, therefore, is said in the Bible concerning ardent spirits.” Page 24, “Whether it be lawful or unlawful, certain it is that it sends five hundred drunkards into eternity every week, and you have the express testimony of the Bible that no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God. As the Bible is true, then are not the manufacturers of ardent spirits in our land (viz. the United States) the means of sending five hundred souls to hell every week.”

From the passages here quoted, we would be almost disposed to think that the absolutes had changed their ground, and that the war was now only with ardent spirits. But let us not be led away with names, for we have already seen that they positively prohibit all intoxicating liquors — The quarrel, then, is with Alcohol, for this is the intoxicating part of ardent spirits. The other constituent part is water, which the absolutes have not yet prohibited. This premised, I now proceed to prove that the use of alcoholic liquors is neither an immorality, nor a violation of the will of God; and if the use of alcoholic liquors is not an immorality, it follows as a natural consequence, that manufacturing and dealing in alcoholic liquors do not necessarily involve any immorality. The Bible is generally allowed, both by christians and infidels, to be the purest and best standard of morality which the world ever possessed, and as it is the word of God, from it only can we learn his will. We shall therefore be guided in our decisions by its plain dictates alone.

In Heb. vii. 1, 2, Melchisedek, king of Salem, is represented as priest of the Most High God, also as king of righteousness and king of peace; but in Genesis xiv. 17, 18, 19, we are told this same Melchisedek brought forth bread and *wine* to Abram, when he returned from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him. Was the King of righteousness and peace, and the Priest of the Most High God, guilty of an immorality in offering drink containing alcohol to Abram? or did Abram, the friend of God, and the father of the faithful, commit an immorality, or a violation of the will of God, by partaking of such drink? These are questions for the absolutes to answer. Genesis xix. 3, we find that Lot made a feast to the angels sent to destroy Sodom, and

that they did eat. We cannot suppose that Lot entertained these distinguished guests without any alcoholic drink, nor can it be proved that the angels did not partake of it. One thing is evident, that the very next morning, when Lot went out of the city, being hastened by the angels, he took wine with him, for in the cave whither he fled, he used alcoholic liquor repeatedly, even to excess. Had the use of alcoholic liquors been an immorality, would the angels have permitted Lot to carry it with him at this awful crisis, when he was snatched as a brand from the burning? Or would the apostle Peter have then called him just and righteous, as we find he does in his second epistle, II. 7, 8? In Genesis, xxvi. 30, we are told that Isaac, the child of promise, made a feast to King Abimelech and his friends, and they did eat and drink. Was Isaac guilty of an immorality by so doing? In Gen. xxvii, 25, 26, 27, 28 verses, we have the conduct of Isaac, when old and full of days, on the occasion of blessing his son, in these words, "And Isaac said, bring it near to me, and I will eat of my son's venison that my soul may bless thee. And he brought it near to him and he did eat; and he brought him *wine* and he drank. And his father Isaac said unto him, come near now and kiss me my son. And he came near and kissed him; and he smelled the smell of his raiment, and blessed him, and said, See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed: therefore God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and *wine*." If the use of alcoholic liquor is an immorality—if it is equal to lying a little, or stealing a little—if it grieves away the Spirit of God, would Isaac have drank it on this solemn occasion, or would he have interceded with God to give plenty of it to his son as a blessing? In Gen. xxix. we read that Laban made a feast at Jacob's marriage, and from

the sequel, it appears that Jacob had been drinking freely, and yet we never read that it was charged against him as an immorality or a violation of the will of God. In Gen. XLIII. 34, we are told that Joseph's brethren drank, and were merry with him (or as the Hebrew word signifies, they drank largely with him,) But who will say that Joseph, the temporal saviour of his father's house, and of Egypt, was guilty of an immorality in giving his brethren alcoholic drink at this time, or that they were violating the will of God by partaking of such drink. Did not the heads of all the tribes of Israel drink largely, and make merry together at this time? Is there an absolute among the thousands who have signed the temperance pledge, who will say that they disapprove of the conduct of the sons of Jacob thus making merry together on this occasion. If there is such an one among them, he may be respected for his consistency, but he cannot be praised for his hospitality. Gen. XLIX. 10, 11, 12, Jacob, in his last benediction to his family, and prophetic predictions regarding their worldly dignity, says of Judah, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. Binding his foal unto the vine, and his asses' colt unto the choice vine, he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes; his eye shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk." Now if the use of alcoholic drink is an immorality, or a violation of the will of God, would the Holy Spirit of prophesy, speaking in the patriarch, have represented the abundance thereof as a blessing of such magnitude as to have connected it with the promise of the Saviour? In Exodus XII. 14, we find the feast of the passover appointed by an ordinance for ever; and in the XXIII. 14, 15, 16 verses, we find also the feasts of harvest and ingathering appointed; and in the XXXIV. 22, 23, this appointment

is confirmed in these words, "Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, of the first fruits of wheat harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end. Thrice in the year shall all your men children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel." But, perhaps, it may be said, that in these feasts no alcohol was used. Certainly we cannot, on the principle of the absolutes, suppose for one moment that God would thus have collected together, thrice every year, the whole of his people, to commit immorality, and violate his holy will in his very presence. But what do the Scriptures say on this subject? In Deuteronomy, xiv. 22d to 26th verses, inclusive, we find the manner of keeping these feasts explained in the following words: "Thou shalt truly tithe all the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth year by year; and thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, of thy *wine*, and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks, that thou mayest learn to fear the Lord thy God always. And if the way be too long for thee, so that thou art not able to carry it, or if the place be too far from thee which the Lord thy God shall choose to set his name there, when the Lord thy God hath blessed thee, then shalt thou turn it into money, and bind up the money in thine hand, and shalt go unto the place which the Lord thy God shall choose; and thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for *wine*, or for *strong drink*, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth, and thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household." Surely, then, if the use of alcoholic liquor is an immorality, a violation of the will of God, this is a strange passage. Is the immutable Jehovah inconsistent with himself? Is the use of that which is moral to-day, to become immoral next year, or in any subsequent

year? I call upon the absolutes to answer these questions honestly, and without sophistry. God is not asleep. He sees their every motion, he hears their every word, he knows their every thought. Let them not think that they are extending his cause while they are thus insulting him to his very face.

You are aware, that under the law of Moses, not a lamb was offered, not a ram, nor a bullock, nor a goat upon the altar of the Lord, but what was accompanied with with a specified quantity of a drink offering,—not of water, as we might suppose, if the doctrine of the absolutes was true, but of strong wine. The passages relating to this are very numerous, I shall therefore mention only a few. Exodus, xxix, 38, 40, 41, “Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar, two lambs of the first year day by day continually. And with the one lamb a tenth deal of flour, mingled with the fourth part of an hin of beaten oil, and the fourth part of an hin of wine, for a drink offering. And the other lamb thou shalt offer at even, and shalt do thereto according to the meat offering of the morning, and according to the drink offering thereof, for a sweet savour an offering made by fire unto the Lord.” Numbers, xv, informs us, that in performing a vow or free-will offering, a lamb was to be accompanied with the fourth part of an hin of wine, a ram with the third part of an hin of wine, and a bullock with half an hin of wine. According to the number that ye shall prepare, so shall ye do to every one according to their number. And from Numbers, xxix, it appears that every sacrifice had its meat offering of flour and oil, and its drink offering of wine. This wine which was to accompany the sacrifices of the children of Israel, was a special provision made by God himself, for the use of the tribe of Levi, who had no inheritance among their brethren, but were to serve at the altar

in holy things. A small portion of the wine offering was poured out unto the Lord, and the remainder belonged to Levi. It is true, they were not permitted to drink wine when they went into the tabernacle of the congregation, as we find it recorded in Leviticus, x, 8, 9, 10, 11, but on all other occasions they were permitted to drink wine. Besides, the Israelites were specially commanded to take the Levites along with them to their feasts, and even to make them merry, by the use of wine and strong drink. Now, what shall we say to these things? Is the use of alcohol, which the holy God enjoined upon his people, and also commanded them to offer to him along with every sacrifice, really an immorality, and inconsistent with his holy will. God commanded all his people to drink and make merry, or rejoice in his presence—the parents and their children together—and was not God who gave this command, in a very peculiar sense, the Father of the Jewish people? were they not his children? But the absolutes say, “The parent should no more suffer his children to drink a little, than to lie a little, or to steal a little.” Is this not a reflection against the parent of the Jewish nation? Had he been a man, would they not have quoted the Jews as a striking illustration of the madness and folly of permitting the use of alcoholic liquor in religious services? And would they not have represented the author of such a system as utterly execrable? Remember that christians worship the same God, and believe in the same Saviour, and are sanctified by the same spirit as the Jews worshipped, believed in, and were sanctified by. But this God commanded the Jews to eat and drink, and rejoice before him, that they might learn to fear him: The same God has commanded the use of alcoholic liquor, by all his people, when assembled at the table peculiarly his own, to celebrate the most solemn ordinance of the christian religion. What could be the Saviour’s meaning, or where were his tender mer-

cies when he appointed this holy ordinance, if the doctrine of the absolntes is true? For they maintain that alcohol was invented by the devil, they say it is the spirit which Satan employs :—

“Appeal to American Youth on Temperance,” page 4, “If while under conviction, a person allows himself to sip a little, he is sure to grieve away the Spirit of God. For unless heaven and hell can work together, God cannot consistently send his Spirit to co-operate with the spirit which Satan employs more than any other agent, in fitting men for his service and kingdom; for what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? and how can two walk together except they be agreed? if then ye know these things, and desire salvation, O beware of sinning against the Holy Ghost.”

I appeal to you as creatures endowed with reasoning faculties, if this sentence does not contain something more than an insinuation against the wisdom and goodness of that Being, who both appointed the rites and ceremonies under the law, and the sacraments under the gospel. Is it possible, that under the law and under the gospel too, God should have appointed the use of that in his Church, which is sure to grieve away his holy spirit from his people, and with which his holy spirit can not co-operate? Is it possible, that the Saviour, in whose benevolence and benificence the christian rests his hope, should thus have united his cause with the cause of darkness, and his kingdom with that of Belial, and left a commandment, which his followers cannot obey without sinning against the Holy Ghost. These are not subtile doctrines, which require the united power of logical and metaphysical reasoning to refute. They only require to be stated honestly, and they refute them-

selves. Reflect that the same kind of drink which God commanded the Jews to use in their feasts and religious duties, he also permitted them to use on ordinary occasions. And is it not a legitimate conclusion, that christians may use in their private intercourse the same kind of drink as they are commanded to use in their religious duties? But the drink commanded in these duties was alcoholic liquor; therefore, by the most natural and legitimate inference, the use of alcoholic liquor is sanctioned among christians by the highest authority. But the absolutes assert, for they do not attempt a proof, that both the wine and strong drink in use among the Jews were very little intoxicating. This assertion is altogether gratuitous, for we find in Numbers, xxviii, 7, that the wine of the drink offering was strong wine; and it has been ascertained by the most accurate chemical experiments, that two glasses of strong wine contain as much alcohol as one glass of proof spirits.—The strong drink therefore among the Jews, must have contained a still higher percentage of alcohol; and who then will say that it was little intoxicating.

The want of observance of the Mosaic ritual was to be visited with awful curses. These we find recorded in the xxviii ch. of Deuteronomy, a few of which I shall subjoin here, that you may know something of their import. In the 22 verse it is said “the Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting, and with mildew, and they shall pursue thee until thou perish.” Verse 28, “And the Lord shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart.” Verse 39, “Thou shalt plant vineyards and dress them; but thou shalt neither drink of the wine nor gather the grapes; for the worms shall eat them.” Verse 41, “Thou shalt beget sons and daughters,

but thou shalt not enjoy them ; for they shall go into captivity." Verses 53 to 57 inclusive, "And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and thy daughters. So that the man who is tender among you and very delicate, his eye shall be evil toward his brother, and towards the wife of his bosom, and towards the remnant of his children, which he shall leave : so that he will not give to any of them of the flesh of his children, whom he shall eat. The tender and delicate woman among you who would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground, for delicateness and tenderness, her eye shall be evil towards the husband of her bosom, and towards her son, and towards her daughter, and towards her young one, and towards her child which she shall bear, for she shall eat them for want of all things, secretly in the siege and straitness wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in the gates." These are but a few of the terrible judgments threatened against the Jews for disobedience to the commandments, and ordinances of the Lord, and all who know the history of that people, know that they were carried into effect even to the very letter. But it is true these curses were not pronounced against the Jews, for the violation of the law respecting the use of wine only. It is also true that the ceremonial law is now abrogated. But if we look into the xxvi ch. of Deuteronomy, it will appear that the observation of the several feasts instituted by the Lord, was guarded with peculiar care, and therefore the want of attention to them must be visited with the severest judgments. The curses which I have quoted above, appear to have been more immediately connected with those stated feasts, which also appears to be particularly noticed by the prophets. I cannot help remarking again in this place, that if the use of alcoholic liquor was not immoral under the law, it cannot be immoral under the gospel, unless it can be shown that it was specially

forbidden. With equal reason might we consider the use of animal food immoral, for it too was used under the law and in the Jewish sacrifices.

Moses in his song recorded in Deuteronomy ch. xxxii, 13 and 14 verses, when praising God for his goodness to Israel says, "The Lord made him ride on the high places of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields, and he made him to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock. Butter of kine, and milk of sheep, with the fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of Bashan, and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of wheat, and thou didest drink the pure blood of the Grape." Had Moses not considered wine as one of the blessings of providence, which might be used as lawfully, and as innocently as any of the other gifts, which are here enumerated, he would not have mentioned it in this place. The use of alcoholic liquor therefore was not considered by Moses either as an immorality or a violation of the will of God. In the prophetic parable of Jotham, recorded in Judges, ix. 12, 13, we find the follow expression, "Then said the trees unto the vine, come thou and reign over us. And the vine said unto them, should I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees." Here it is plainly asserted that alcohol cheereth God, and shall we yet maintain that the use of it is an immorality, and contrary to the will of God. If we do we must indeed be slow of heart to believe the scriptures. In second Samuel, vi. 19, we find it recorded that when David had brought the ark of the Lord to Zion, the very same day, "He dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel, as well among the women as the men, to every one a cake of bread, and a good piece of flesh, and a flagon of wine." If David had considered the use of alcoholic liquors an immorality, or a violation of the

will of God, what an awful conclusion did he here make, to the solemn services of that ever memorable day.

Nehemiah was governor in Jerusalem during part of the time in which the second Temple was in building, and was esteemed a lenient and abstemious governor. But in the v. 18, of his book he writes, "Now that which was prepared for me daily was one ox and six choice sheep, also fowls were prepared for me, and once in ten days, store of all sorts of wine." If Nehemiah had lived among us at this day, would not the absolutes have called him an intemperate man, for using such quantities of alcoholic drink? And when he died would they not have enroled him among the five hundred intemperate whom they consign to hell every week? It was well for Nehemiah that his place was fixed, before the absolutes usurped the judgment seat. Again in the viii. 12, we find, that after Nehemiah had forbidden the people to weep, when they had heard the law, and were convinced of their sins, that he sent them home to feast and rejoice. "And all the people went their way to eat and drink, and to send portions, and to make great mirth, because they had understood the words that were declared unto them." Is not this what the absolutes call drowning conviction at the bottle? For (say they) unless heaven and hell can work together, God cannot consistently send his Spirit to co-operate with alcohol. What an awful reprobate in the estimation of the absolutes must Nehemiah appear, who thus, by one awful mandate, drowned conviction in a whole nation. But this is not all that Nehemiah did, for he tells us in the xii. 11, 12, 13, 14, verses, "Then contended I with the rulers, and said, why is the house of God forsaken; and I gathered the Levites together, and set them in their place. Then brought all Judah, the tithe of the corn and the new wine, and the oil, unto the treasuries. And I made

treasurers over the treasuries—and their office was to distribute unto their brethren.” What an awful regardless man must Nehemiah have been, if the doctrine of the absolutes is true, not only to bring alcoholic liquor into the very house of the Lord, but also to bring in the priests, the Lord’s ministers to drink it there. But what does Nehemiah say in the very next verse: “remember me, O my God, concerning this, and wipe not out my good deeds that I have done, for the house of my God and for the offices thereof.” This prayer was either a solemn mockery on the part of Nehemiah, or he did not believe that the use of alcohol was an immorality. Nehemiah’s conduct altogether appears directly contrary to the standards of the absolutes, still it would be presumptuous in you to doubt even, that the absolutes are not correct. For in a passage which has already been quoted it is said, “Wo to that man who at this crisis, shall knowingly encourage the exciting cause of such evils, (that is to say alcohol,) I see for him the wine of the wrath of God poured out without mixture, into the cup of his indignation”, &c. This is not jesting. It is given as the prophetic vision of his reverence. But where he has found that it was applicable to the cause of the absolutes, I know not. In Revelation, xiv. 10, we find the same language applied expressly to the worshipers of the beast and his image, and unless this scripture is misapplied, then alcohol is the beast mentioned in the revelation, which appears altogether a new idea. Such a use of scripture is a melancholy proof of the want of that reverence which is due to the sacred oracles. By such a perversion of scripture even drunkenness can be vindicated as a duty commanded by the Lord God of Israel. For it is said in Jeremiah, xv. 27, 28, “Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel; drink ye and be drunken, and spue, and fall, and rise no more. And it shall be if they refuse to take the cup at thine hand to drink, then

shalt thou say unto them ; thus saith the Lord of hosts : ye shall certainly drink." I ask the absolutes if they would consider it fair dealing with scripture, if any man should bring forward this scripture as an argument or an apology for drunkenness. Certainly it has no such meaning, but the very reverse, taken in its proper connection, but taken without any regard to its connection, it is nothing less than a positive command to drunkenness. Every feeling in the christian bosom revolts at thus handling the word of God deceitfully. But as I shall have occasion in another lecture to direct your attention more immediately to the way in which the absolutes handle the word of God, I shall not further anticipate the subject at present. In Psalm, civ. 14, 15, it is said, "God causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man, that he may bring forth food out of the earth ; and wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart." Wine is here directly ascribed to God as one of his creatures, given to man expressly for the purpose of making his heart glad. But the absolutes themselves cannot deny that it is the alcohol in the wine, which maketh the heart glad ; therefore, alcohol, without all controversy, is one of the good creatures of God, and given for the express purpose of exhilarating our animal spirits. But this is often denied in the Temperance Bible. Scripture arguments for temperance, Page 11, it is written, "When men, in abuse of the divine bounty, have made this foul poison (viz. alcohol) to justify its use, and give it currency, they call it one of the 'creatures of God.' With as much propriety might they call gambling establishments, and murderous weapons his creatures, and thus encourage their general use. But how awful the impiety of thus ascribing the worst of man's inventions, to the benevolent God." I leave you to judge whether or not this is according to the

Scripture last quoted. It is there said, that wine is one of the divine blessings, it is here said, that alcohol, which is the very property in wine which maketh glad the heart of man, is one of the worst of man's inventions. How these two declarations are to be reconciled I know not.

In the appeal to American Youth, page 3, Solomon is represented as forbidding the use of wine. Let us see what his writings say on this subject, that we may ascertain what credit is to be placed on this assertion. In Proverbs, ix, 1 to 6 inclusive, it is said, "Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars; she hath killed her beasts; she hath mingled her wine; she hath also furnished her table; she hath sent forth her maidens: she crieth upon the highest places of the city, whoso is simple let him turn in hither: as for him that wanteth understanding, she saith to him, come eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled. — Forsake the foolish, and live, and go in the way of understanding." Can any man read this passage and not be struck with the conduct of the absolutes, as being in direct opposition to that of Wisdom, in every particular? She spreads her table, prepares her wine, and sends out her maidens to urge the simple and those who want understanding, to forsake the foolish, and come and eat of her bread and drink of her wine. The absolutes send out their maidens also, into the highest places in the city, to cry, and use all their arts and influence to turn away those who are following Wisdom's advice, and to persuade them to leave her table, because she uses alcohol, which is an immorality, a violation of the will of God. The absolutes have tried every art, and wrought upon all the tender and benevolent feelings of the female heart, to induce the ladies to espouse their cause. And it does the ladies infinite credit, that so many of them have had the good sense to resist their insinua-

tions and their misrepresentations. It would be cruel in me were I to touch the same strings, and cause them to vibrate in a different direction. No, I cannot act so unfeelingly to those whom I respect so sincerely. I only ask the ladies to reflect whether or not as members of the Temperance Societies, they can act the part of those whom wisdom sent out ; and I know their own good sense will point out their duty, and that they will not be slow to discharge that duty. I am aware the absolutes will say, this passage from Proverbs is not to be taken in its literal sense, and that Wisdom's feast had no reference to wine, except in a metaphorical sense. But here there is no room for dispute, for the Saviour himself has explained it : Matthew's Gospel, xi. 18, 19, " John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say he hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners: but Wisdom is justified of her children." It is evident that the Saviour here refers to the passage which we have quoted from the Proverbs in vindication of his conduct, and, therefore, may be understood in a literal sense. If you would read the eighth chapter of Proverbs, you would there see that Wisdom was no mean personage, she was the companion of God from eternity, and his daily delight. In Ecclesiastes ii, 24, it is said, " There is nothing better for a man, than, that he should eat, and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy good in his labour, this also I saw that it was from the hand of God." In the iii, 12, 13, he confirms and strengthens the same opinion when he says, " I know that there is no good in them (that is, the labours of men) but for a man to rejoice, and do good in his life. And also, that every man should eat, and drink, and enjoy the good of all his labours ; it is the gift of God." Had the absolutes not quoted from the

writings of Solomon we would almost have believed that they had never read them. Solomon certainly says, "wine is a mocker, and strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise." But this is only cautioning against the abuse, and not prohibiting the use either of wine or strong drink, otherwise he never could have written what I have already quoted, without having been guilty of gross inconsistency.

But there is still more in Solomon's writings on this subject, worthy of your notice. For it is said, Ecclesiastes v ch. 18, 19, "It is good and comely for one to eat, and to drink, and to enjoy the good of all his labours, that he taketh under the sun, all the days of his life which God giveth him, for it is his portion. And every man also to whom God hath given riches, and wealth, and hath given him power to eat thereof, and to take his portion, and to rejoice in his labour, this is the gift of God," viii ch. 15, "Then I commended mirth, because a man has no better thing under the sun, than to eat, and to drink, and to be merry, for that shall abide with him of his labour all the days of his life, which God giveth him under the sun."—ix ch. 7, "Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart, for God now accepteth thy works." After these quotations, can you really believe that the absolutes are dealing honestly with scripture when they quote Solomon as an authority to support the doctrine of absolute abstinence. This is certainly sinning against the clearest light. There is no trade under heaven more reprehensible than dishonest dealing with the word of God. It is vastly more contemptible, and degrading, and immoral, and contrary to the will of God, than either manufacturing, dealing in, or moderately using alcoholic liquors. The

devil himself quoted the scriptures most dexterously, when he tempted the Saviour in the wilderness, but he did not quote them honestly ; and what a striking family likeness, in this respect, is there between the arch-enemy and the absolutes. It is well known to every divine that the Song of Solomon expresses the mutual love between Christ and the church. In this Song, v. 1, we find the Saviour addressing the church in these words, "I am come into my garden, my sister, my spouse ; I have gathered my myrrh with my spice ; I have eaten my honey-comb with my honey ; I have drunk my wine with my milk ; eat, O friends, drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved." This is the voice of the chief-shepherd, and how like the voice of a beloved friend. It savours little of the method of building up the church, and of moralizing, and christianizing the world which the absolutes have adopted. In the prophecies of Isaiah, the want of wine is generally used as a symbol to represent great national distress, and its abundance to represent national prosperity and peace. Thus, in the xxiv ch. 7 to 12, it is said, "The new wine mourneth, the vine languisheth, all the merry hearted do sigh. The mirth of tabrets ceaseth, the noise of them that rejoice endeth, the joy of the harp ceaseth. They shall not drink wine with a song, strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it. There is a crying for wine in the streets, all joy is darkened, the mirth of the land is gone. In the city is left desolation, and the gate is smitten with destruction."— Again in the xxvii. 2, 3, it is said, "In that day sing ye unto her, a vineyard of red wine. I the Lord do keep it, I will water it every moment ; lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day." We cannot suppose that the prophet would have made use of such expressions, had the use of alcoholic liquors been an immorality. Jeremiah also

represents the want of wine as a national calamity, and abundance of wine as a proof of the favour of the Lord. In Joel II. 19, 24, it is said, "Yea, the Lord will answer and say unto his people, behold I will send you corn, and wine, and oil, and ye shall be satisfied therewith, and I will no more make you a reproach among the heathen. And the floors shall be full of wheat, and the fats shall overflow with wine and oil." Can we conclude from this that the use of alcoholic liquors is an immorality or that it grieves the spirit of God? If so, the scriptures are evidently calculated to mislead us. It is asked triumphantly in the T. B. from what hill, or mountain, or from what stream of God's bounty strong drink flows? The two following quotations will answer the question: Joel III. 18, "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the mountains shall drop down new wine, and all the hills shall flow with milk, and all the rivers of Judah shall flow with water." Amos IX. 13, 14, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed, and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt. And I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them, and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof, they shall also make gardens and eat the fruit of them." Do not these quotations from scripture answer the question from the T. B. regarding the source from which strong drink flows to man? And did the spirit of prophecy foretel this great abundance of alcoholic drink as a blessing or a curse? It certainly does not require any great depth of Biblical learning to discover, that the Lord did intend that his people should consider it as a blessing. But, is it reasonable to suppose that the God of Israel could have taught his people to

receive and use that as a blessing, the use of which was really an immorality, and contrary to his own holy will? Prejudice and blinded zeal in support of a favourite theory, may lead men to make use of such assertions, but reason never can. In Zechariah ix. 15, 16, 17, it is said, "The Lord of Hosts shall defend them, (that is the Sons of Zion), and they shall devour and subdue with sling stones; and they shall drink and make a noise as through wine; and they shall be filled like bowls, and as the corners of the altar. And the Lord their God shall save them in that day as the flock of his people, for they shall be as the stones of a crown lifted up as an ensign upon his land. For how great is his goodness, and how great is his beauty. Corn shall make the young men cheerful, and new wine the maids." No one can read the chapter from which this quotation is taken, without being convinced that this prediction was not to be realized under the law, but under the gospel. For it was to be after the Saviour had ridden in triumph into Jerusalem; after he should have spoken peace unto the heathen, and after his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth. Here we find that the Lord's people are to make a noise as through wine, when they drink, but still it is not to be with wine. Yet even then the Lord shall defend them and make them victorious, and save them as the flock of his people. But what is it that is to cause them to make a noise as through wine? It is evidently what calls forth from the prophet the exclamation of gratitude contained in the 17th verse:—"How great is his goodness and how great is his beauty? Corn shall make the young men cheerful, and new wine the maids." It will not, I presume, be doubted by any christian, that the spirit of prophecy, to whom the end was known from the beginning, knew perfectly that

during the gospel ages alcoholic drink would be prepared from corn. It is perfectly evident that it was a *drink* made from grain which the prophet here alludes to, and not eating of bread made of corn, for it was to prove a similar stimulus to the young men, and to produce the very self-same effect, as new wine did upon the maids, that is, it was to make them cheerful, or, as the original might be rendered, it was to make them speak. Many of you, I am persuaded, have witnessed this prophesy fulfilled to the very letter.—Have you never seen young men making themselves cheerful with malt liquors, while the young maids were producing the same effect with the blood of the grape? Nor is there the slightest doubt on my mind, that the prophet hailed this event as a special manifestation of the great goodness of God. And for this very reason, that when the kingdom of Christ was extended from the river to the ends of the earth, many countries, disqualified by their local situation from yielding wine to cheer his people, would then be supplied with a drink from corn, possessing the same stimulating qualities which had been long known in the wine. This prophesy also teaches us that the corn would yield even a more stimulating drink than wine, inasmuch as young men generally require a more powerful stimulus, than maids do, to produce the same degree of hilarity or cheerfulness.—After this quotation, will you believe, with the absolutes, that not a word is said in the Bible regarding ardent spirits?

Having now concluded our examination of the Old Testament scriptures, in so far as respects the morality of using alcoholic liquor, I hope I may, without giving offence to any one, say that the scriptures of the Old Testament afford us no authority whatever for saying that the use of alcoholic drink is an immorality, or contrary to the will of

God, but the very reverse. We have there seen that all the patriarchs used alcoholic liquor, can we then for one moment believe that "to drink a little" ought to be ranked in the same class of vices as "to lie a little, or, to steal a little?" or, can you really believe that it is a vice at all?—From the quotations I have made from the Old Testament, as well as from many other passages therein contained, it is placed beyond the power of dispute, that the Lord of Hosts, the giver of every good and perfect gift to man, does claim the honour of bestowing on us alcoholic drink, and teaches us to look upon it as one of his richest temporal blessings. But it is said in one of the quotations I have already made from the T. B. that, "if endless exclusion from the kingdom of heaven is the drunkard's doom, can he be held guiltless, who deliberately prepared for him, and, perhaps, placed in his hand, the cup of death and damnation?" Is not this charging God to his face with the destruction of the drunkard? Again, it is said in the same quotation as above, that, "wilfully persevering to furnish the sure means of death, you carry to the judgment the murderer's character as clearly as the midnight assassin." But, God claims the honour of furnishing the means. Is not this then clothing the Holy One of Israel in the character of a murderer? Is not this holding Him up to derision, and contempt, and spurning at His gifts to man? Does it not approach nearly within the sphere of blasphemy? The Jews, who lived at a distance from the place where God had set his name, were (as you have heard) permitted, if not commanded, to purchase and to use alcoholic liquors when they attended the solemn feasts. But where, or how, would they have purchased if there had been none engaged in that traffic? And, was not this sanctioning both the use and traffic in alcoholic liquors, by the very highest possible

authority ? Yet, a sentence from the T. B. tells us gravely that the use of ardent spirits meets no support in the Bible, or the conscience, and the traffic meets none. Can there be a more palpable falsehood, or a more direct case of speaking lies in hypocrisy than this ? Do these men not know that the same authority which declares that the drunkard shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven, also declares that there shall in no wise enter into the new Jerusalem any thing that worketh abomination, or maketh a lie ? O, my friends, if you could but see the vortex of absurdities and abominations in which you are involved, by this system, you would stand horror struck at the prospect. Were you placed in the rapids of Niagara, without hope of escape, it would be nothing to the thrill of horror which would chill your souls, if I could, in one view, set before you all the consequences of this system. But it is, perhaps, premature to make such remarks until I have submitted the evidence from the New Testament.

LECTURE III.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Having, in my last lecture, set before you what is said in the law and the prophets regarding the use of alcoholic liquor, we shall next examine what is said by the apostles, and then conclude this head by the authority of Him, in whom all the types and ceremonies of the law are centered, and from whom

all the blessings of the gospel flow. In the Acts of the Apostles xv. 28, 29, we find a copy of the apostolic requirements from the Gentile converts in these words, "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication, from which if you keep yourselves, ye shall do well." There is here no injunction whatever regarding abstaining from intoxicating liquors; and certainly had the use of these been an immorality it would have been specified, for the Gentiles were, at that period, in the habit of abusing intoxicating drinks by great excess. In 1st Cor. ix. 4, Paul, speaking of his liberty as an apostle, puts the following question among others to his Corinthian converts, "Have we not power to eat and to drink?" Surely if the apostle had considered drinking, or the use of alcoholic liquor, an immorality, or if he had been in the habit of teaching that the use of it was contrary to the will of God, he never would have put such a question to the christians at Corinth. Again in the x. 27, 30, 31, he says, "If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no questions for conscience sake. For, if I by grace be a partaker, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?—Whether, therefore, ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." But if Paul had considered the use of alcoholic liquor in the same light as the absolutes do, could he possibly have uttered a grosser absurdity than this? It would have been nothing less than calling upon christians to glorify God by an immorality. But the absolutes may, perhaps, say that the apostle here must allude to water and not intoxicating drink. But Paul settles this point himself in the xi. 20, 21, 22, 33, 34, where he says, "When ye come together, therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's

supper. For in eating, every one taketh before other his own supper, and one is hungry and another is drunken. What, have ye not houses to eat and to drink in, or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not ?” Now, had the early christians drunk nothing but water they would not have been drunken. The apostle, even at this crisis, when christians sat at the Lord’s table, celebrating that ordinance till they were drunken, does not say one word to lead us to suppose that the use of this intoxicating drink was immoral, on the contrary, he tells them to eat and drink at home, leaving their own good sense to regulate the quantity they should use. It is quite evident that, in this instance, Paul gives the sanction of his apostolic authority to conviviality, in its proper place, while he prohibits the continuance of the practise in the Church of God, when met to celebrate the Lord’s supper. In Colossians, II. the apostle warns the church not to be led astray by the traditions of men, and vain deceits, and the rudiments of the world, to disregard the judgment of the world on their conduct in meat and drink. He also cautions them against submitting to the ordinances of the ceremonial law, and the commandments and doctrines of men. Which things (he says) have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship and humility, and neglecting of the body, not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh. Is not the mighty effort of the absolutes one of the very things which the apostle here strenuously cautions the Colossians against ? Is it not a show of wisdom ? Is it not a voluntary humility ? Is it not in reality a neglecting of the body ? Is it not a vain deceit ? Yet the quotation which you find in the mouth of every absolute is found within parenthesis in this very passage—(Col. II. 16, 23, Touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using)—applies directly to the ordinances and commandments and doctrines of men, and if you search the whole

word of God from beginning to end you will not find a single passage more directly and more expressly condemning the whole system of absolute abstinence than that very passage, which they have continually on their tongue as a scripture authority.

Brethren, men who would thus pervert the scriptures to serve their own corrupt ends, and to mislead you, are not entitled to your confidence, they merit none of your sympathies. They are blind guides, and if you follow them, you must fall with them into the ditch. 1st Tim. III. 2, 3, 8, we find that a bishop must be sober and not given to wine, and that deacons must be grave and not given to much wine.— But, in neither of these instances, is wine prohibited; the excess only is forbidden. In the 4th ch. of this same epistle, the apostle declares that the Spirit had foretold the very heresies which have prevailed so extensively on this continent. “Now (says the apostle) the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats, which God has created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good and nothing to be refused; if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.” Have not these very things, which the Spirit foretold should come to pass in the latter days, been fulfilled? Have you not heard that there is a society almost co-eval with the Temperance Society, the object of which is to turn marriage into ridicule, and banish it from the earth? Have you not publicly, and frequently, and urgently, and insultingly in many cases, been commanded to abstain from meats, which

God has created to be received with thanksgiving? Are we not warranted then, on the authority of the apostle, to pronounce these to be the doctrines of devils, and that they are taught by those who speak lies in hypocrisy? Shall you then any longer listen with complacency to these doctrines, after knowing the source from which they flow? Or, will you still set aside the doctrines of eternal truth, that you may receive and propagate the doctrines of eternal falsehood? I am well aware that many, who are not absolutes at heart, support the cause as a matter of expediency. But is it expedient to do evil that good may come? Is it expedient to break the commandments of God, in order to promote his glory? Is it expedient to shut our ears against the word of God, lest knowing his will and not doing it we should be beaten with many stripes? Is it expedient for christians to stand back from the table of the Lord, lest they should be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, by partaking unworthily? It was by urging the eating of the forbidden fruit as a matter of expediency, that the devil first prevailed against the human race, and shall he still catch us in the same snare? It was a matter of expediency that the devil pleaded when he suggested to the Saviour, that he should command the stones to be made bread. In short, they know little of his history, who do not know that he can assume the appearance of the saint, or the angel of light, when it serves his purpose to do so.—Whenever expediency urges us to do what is contrary to any of the commandments of God, rest assured the adversary is at your side, fawning and placid as the tiger or panther, to allure you within his reach, that he may spring upon you in a moment and devour you. But, leaving this digression, let us follow out what is said farther in the scriptures, in confutation of the assertion, “that the use of alcoholic liquor is an immorality.” 1st Tim. viii. 23, Paul says his

commands upon Timothy in the following words : " Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities." In this passage there are several things worthy of remark. In the first place it shows clearly that Paul, in his injunctions respecting bishops, did not mean that they should abstain from the use of alcoholic drink, for Timothy was a bishop, and he is here specially commanded to drink wine. But, can any man believe, that the apostle Paul, who was immediately under the influence of the Divine Spirit, should, in his instructions to the church, regarding the qualifications of her principal teachers, prohibit them from using alcoholic liquors, and in a few sentences thereafter positively command them to use such drink? Such blundering would disgrace a school-boy, and can we suppose that the great apostle of the Gentiles could possibly be guilty of such trifling? In the second place, this verse teaches us plainly, that the apostle, in his epistle to the Romans, xiv, 21, where he says, " It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, or any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak," had no intention to prohibit the use of these things, generally. This instruction, as I have already proved, was for a particular purpose, and not for general observation. Had it been intended to apply in all cases, is not the apostle, in his instructions to Timothy, directly contradicting himself? Had Paul forgotten, at the time he wrote to Timothy, the nature of the instructions he gave to the christians at Rome, or, rather, had the Holy Spirit of God, under whose immediate influence the apostle wrote, forgotten these instructions, or become mutable? In the third place, this verse is a direct condemnation of the water man pursued by the absolutes. It appears that Timothy had been a milk-and-water man. But, Paul, who was his

father in the Lord, lays his apostolic injunction upon him to give up that abstemious system and to use alcoholic liquor. But, why did Paul do this? Was it to destroy the health, or to shorten the life of his beloved Timothy?—Certainly not. It was for the express purpose of improving his strength and prolonging his life. But, would Paul have commanded Timothy to practice an immorality in order to improve his health; or, to do an immoral deed, even to save his life? Most certainly he never would.—Would Paul have thus commanded Timothy to “sip a little,” if, by doing so, he had thought he would thereby have grieved away the Spirit of God? No; he never would. If Paul had thought that, by thus forcing the cup upon Timothy, he was clothing himself in the murderer’s character, would he have done so? No; he never would. It is evident then that Paul looked upon the use of alcoholic liquor as perfectly innocent, and quite consistent with the highest attainments in the christian life; also, that it was, in his estimation, calculated to renovate the health, invigorate the body, and prolong the life of man. How strange then, that the absolutes should make the apostle Paul their chief corner stone, seeing that he has written expressly against the whole system, and denied their doctrines in toto. But they, on the other hand, give him the lie, and if we believe their arguments, we must also believe that the apostle Paul did not understand the meaning of what he wrote, any more than the pen which he used in the operation. Again, in Paul’s epistle to Titus, i. 7. and ii. 2, 3, 6, he says, “A bishop must not be given to wine,—That the aged men be sober, grave, temperate. The aged women, likewise, that they be not given to much wine.—Young men, likewise, exhort to be sober minded.” In none of these injunctions does it appear that the apostle

had the slightest intention to prohibit the use of stimulating drink. In 2 Peter ii. 13, and in Jude, 12 verse, we learn that the feasts of love, or feasts of charity among the primitive christians, even during the age of the apostles, had been scandalized by the improper conduct of ungodly men, who had crept in among them. In these feasts alcoholic drink was in common use, and sometimes indulged in even to excess, as we have already seen in Paul's epistle to the Corinthians. But none of the apostles ever insinuate the propriety of giving up the use, in order to prevent the abuse of alcoholic drink. I presume all who have attended, without prejudice, to these arguments, will find disposed now to say, that they do not believe the apostles prohibit the use of alcoholic liquors.

But we come now to examine how the example, and the precepts, of the Lord Jesus Christ bear upon this subject, and if you find these corroborating what has already been adduced, will it be too much for me to expect, that you will acknowledge I have proved what I proposed, and shown, even to demonstration, that the use of alcoholic liquor is neither an immorality nor a violation of the will of God.

In Matthew, vi, 32, 33, it is said, "Take no thought, saying, what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewith all shall we be clothed, for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." This is not the declaration of a mere man, but of him whom all christians esteem as the head of the church, and of whom the prophet Isaiah in the ix, 6, thus speaks:—"Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the

government shall be upon his shoulder : and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace." This same great Being has, in the passage above quoted, plainly declared that we need drink as much as we do food and raiment, and we have his promise who cannot lie, that drink shall be given to his people. Nor was this drink water only. No, it was such drink as the nations of the world look after, namely, strong drink. This appears evident from the parallel passage in Luke's gospel, xii, 29, 30, " And seek not ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind ; for all these things do the nations of the world seek after, and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things." Is the use then of alcoholic drink an immorality, or contrary to the will of God ? And yet God knows we have need of it, and promised that if we seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, that he will give us this drink. You see then, that the very supposition that it is an immorality, makes the promises of God even worse than unmeaning.

But we have the best reason to believe, that this great Being whom the prophet calls the mighty God, the everlasting Father, namely, the Lord Jesus, used wine himself, and by so doing he used alcohol,—for there is no such thing as wine without alcohol. For he himself says, in Matthew, xi, 19, " The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." The calumny, then which the pharisees brought against the Saviour, was precisely the same which the absolutes bring against his servants now, who in this particular imitate his example. But, if the great head of the church had wished his followers to abstain from the use of alcoholic liquors, would he himself have used them?

And since he has used them, are his people guilty of an immorality in following his example? But the absolutes say, to all who imitate the example of the Saviour in this particular, that they are guilty of an immorality. If then this doctrine of the absolutes is true, the conclusion is irresistible, that Christ Jesus, by using alcoholic liquor, was guilty of an immorality, and a violation of the will of God; that is, he sinned against himself, and violated his own holy will. Awfully revolting idea. This is nothing less than downright blasphemy against the holy one of God. Is not this denying the Lord that bought us? Is not this the doctrine of devils? Is not this the grossest heresy that ever disgraced the Church of Christ? Is not this what the apostle Peter foresaw, when he says, in his second epistle, II. 1, 2 3, "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you; who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction; and many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of, and through covetousness, shall they with feigned words make merchandize of you; whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not." Now it may be asked, what are the features in the character of the absolutes which makes this prophecy applicable to them? In answer to this, I would say that it was brought in privily. Those who support the cause, maintain that it involves no political principle, and that it has no sectarian tendency. Is not this bringing it in privily, by quieting the fears and jealousies of the public? In the second place, it makes the Saviour an immoral being. Is not this denying the Lord that bought them? In the third place, many have followed their pernicious ways. Do not the absolutes now boast of hundreds of thousands supporting their cause? In the fourth

place, the way of truth, by reason of them, is evil spoken of. Is this not eminently the case with the absolutes? Do they not hold up to ridicule the permission so frequently and so fully granted in the scriptures to use alcoholic liquors? Do they not speak evil most unceremoniously of all those, who follow the way of truth in this respect? Do they not, by their misrepresentations, lay open the word of God to the scoff and ridicule of unbelievers. In the fifth place, through covetousness, with feigned words, they make merchandize of you. Is not this peculiarly the case with the absolutes? They tell you that supporting this system would cost you nothing, but would be a direct saving of many millions of dollars every year. That they speak to you with feigned words, you require only to read the temperance bible to be fully convinced of this fact. There you will find many assertions, without arguments, and many arguments founded on data gratuitously assumed, and conclusions drawn from scripture quotations, which give no countenance whatever to this unballowed scheme, which is subverting the plainest dictates of the word of God. If this prediction is not applicable to the absolutes, it cannot be denied that there is a singular coincidence between their character and the character of those described in the prediction. But let us now look a little farther into the Saviour's history, and we shall find the doctrines of the absolutes still more clearly confuted. We find in Luke x. 6, 7, 8, that when the Saviour sent out his seventy disciples by two and two, to go before him into every city to preach the gospel, he laid upon them the following injunctions:—“Into whatsoever house ye enter, first say peace be to this house, and if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it; if not, it shall return to you again. And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give, for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not

from house to house. And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you." Now, that the use of wine, and strong drink, or of alcoholic liquor was as common among the Jews as ever it was among any other people on the face of the earth, cannot be disputed. Neither can it be disputed that, no nation ever surpassed them in the duties of hospitality. Their bread, and their wine, with a cordial welcome, greeted the stranger wherever he went. Bear in mind, that it was among a people of this social and hospitable character, that the Saviour sent his apostles, saying unto them, "Into whatsoever house ye enter there remain eating and drinking such things as they give ;" and then say that the use of alcoholic drink meets no countenance in the word of God. Nothing can be plainer, than, that the Saviour not only countenances, but positively commands his disciples to drink whatsoever the hospitality of their entertainers should set before them, no matter whether that was water, wine, or strong drink, there is no exception. If then the use of alcoholic liquor is an immorality, it requires no metaphysical reasoning to arrive at the conclusion, that Christ has here bound his disciples by a positive commandment, to commit immorality. Can any man who professes to be a christian, subscribe to such a doctrine as this ? or lend the influence of his name to build up and support a system which makes the blessed Jesus the author of sin. But if you cannot subscribe to the doctrine that the Lord Jesus has commanded his followers to commit immorality, you cannot subscribe the pledge of absolute abstinence which involves this doctrine, and consequently must subscribe to the fact, that the use of alcoholic liquor is not an immorality, and that the absolutes are teaching you doctrines of their own invention,

instead of the commandments of God. It does appear to me, that the commandment our Lord gave to his disciples, to eat and drink such things as were set before them, was not so much intended for his immediate disciples, to whom it was addressed, as it was for the direction of his church on this particular point, through all generations. For the disciples who were Jews, were in the habit of partaking freely, of the hospitality of their brethren the Jews, and would therefore appear to have required no special commandment on this subject. But, remember, all eternity was present to the omniscient eye of the Saviour. He saw clearly through the long vista of ages the days in which we now live—he saw the doctrines now inculcated by the absolutes, in all their pernicious tendencies,—and to counteract their influence he leaves this commandment on record for the direction of his people in all ages of his church.

The cause of the absolutes may flourish for a time, but we know assuredly it must finally come to nought, for the Saviour has told us, that, when he comes to the judgement, the inhabitants of the world will be eating, and drinking, marrying, and given in marriage. In John's Gospel, II, 2 to 10 inclusive, we find the Saviour converting water into wine at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. It is worthy of remark, that this was the first miracle which the Saviour performed to establish his divine mission. It is also worthy of remark, that this miracle was not performed as most of his other miracles were, in order to produce an effect, which could not have been obtained without a miracle. We can scarcely suppose that wine could not have been procured for money in Cana of Galilee. Besides it is evident that the company for whom it was thus

miraculously provided, had already drunk freely, having consumed all that was provided for the feast. The governor of the feast, also, faults the bridegroom, not only for withholding the good wine, at the beginning of the feast, and not giving them what was inferior when they had well drunk, but for having kept the good wine until now; that is, even to a period when they had done more than ever well drunk. If then the use of alcoholic liquor is an immorality, what can you think of this commencement of the Saviour's public ministry. He not only by his presence, and example countenanced the use, but also exerted his divine power to supply the article, and gave it to them in abundance, without money, and without price. Will any man in the face of this solemn transaction, hold up his head and say, that either the manufacturing, or using alcoholic liquor is an immorality. This would be too palpable an absurdity to pass undetected even by the most illiterate believer in Jesus. Let us suppose, that, a manufacturer of alcoholic liquors in our day, were to send his produce to the dealers, with orders to distribute them to the public gratuitously, what would the absolutes say of such a man? Would they not look upon him as a monster? Would not the whole society resound in the language of the T. B. Monster Destroyed, page 20, "The use of ardent spirits meets no support in the bible or the conscience, and the traffic meets none. Be firm. Be decided. Be courageous. Connect your cause with heaven. It is the cause of God; the cause for which Immanuel died. O, as men and patriots, banish intemperance with all its sources from your country and the land. As ministers and christians, banish it forever from the churches of the living God. Let the demon no longer hide in the sanctuary. Let entire abstinence be written in capitals, over the door of every church. Expel for

ever the accursed enemy, that the spirit of the Lord may descend and bless us with life and peace. Entire abstinence is the only weapon which will destroy the monster. Have you supported this cruel kingdom of darkness and death?—Will you do it longer? Shall conscience be riven by the act? Shall the land that bears you be cursed; the young around you be sporting with hell; the awakened sinner be drowning conviction at his bottle; the once fair communicant be disgraced; the once happy congregation be rent; its ministry be driven from the altar, and its sanctuary crumble to ruin? Shall our benevolent institutions fail, and our liberties be sacrificed? Shall God be grieved?—Shall the wailings from the bottomless pit, hereafter reproach and agonize you as the cause of the ruin, perhaps of your children and children's children?" This is the language they use, and such a declamation as this, on such a subject, appears to be an insult both to God and man, a solemn mockery of the Saviour, and directly contrary to the word of God. Where did the reverend author of this wonderful pamphlet discover that christians should observe entire abstinence? Where did he discover that entire abstinence is the cause of God, and the cause for which the Saviour died? These doctrines are no where contained in the Bible, and unless he can prove that he had them by immediate revelation from heaven, they are utterly unworthy of your reception. All the three characters which the absolutes consign to wailings in the bottomless pit, viz : the manufacturer, the distributor, and the consumer of alcoholic liquors, are united in the person of the Saviour, during his attendance on the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. So long, therefore, as the manufacturer makes his liquors of good quality, and the dealer is careful to obtain it good, and to dispose of it unadulterated, and the

consumer to use it in moderation, they cannot be condemned by man, without censuring the conduct of the Lord of glory. Those who in this traffic deal honourably, and those who use these blessings of providence, so as not to abuse them, have nothing to fear from the anathema maranatha of the absolutes, for the Saviour, who set the example in his own person, is the same who is appointed to be their judge, and this honour he will not make over to another. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, a gluttonous man, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners, how much more shall they call them of his household ? But the Saviour, in the character of judge, has told us the very sentence of approbation which he will pass on his people, at the great day of final retribution, together with his reasons for doing so. These you will find strange reasons, if the absolutes are correct. They are recorded in Matthew xxv, from the 31st verse, and are the following :—“ When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory ; and before him shall be gathered all nations ; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat ; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink ; I was a stranger, and ye took me in ; naked, and ye clothed me ; I was sick, and ye visited me ; I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.” Were the absolutes aware that such a passage as this was

contained in the word of God ? If so, would they have dared to forbid, as an immorality, what the Judge of all thus delights to honour ? I am afraid they have neither read this, nor the following part of the chapter, where it is recorded, “ Then shall he say also unto them on his left hand, depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels ; for I was an hungred and ye gave me no meat ; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink ; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in ; naked, and ye clothed me not ; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.”

Are the absolutes not running the imminent danger of being roused to a sense of the folly and madness of their favourite scheme, by this awful and unexpected repulse from the Judge of all the earth ? Surely a system, which involves such contradictions, and manifests such oppositions to the infallible standard of truth and duty, cannot have any title to the support of those who know and believe in that standard. I would say then to all who believe in this standard, and yet are trembling lest the *tender mercies* of this society should overtake them, “ Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul ; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” Are you not astonished when you hear any man, who professes to be a Minister of Christ, urging upon ministers and christians in general, to banish alcoholic liquors for ever from the churches of the living God, and to write entire abstinence in capitals over the door of every church ? Can you conscientiously receive

such a man, as a Minister of Christ? No, my friends; Christ foresaw that the time would come, when such men would creep into the church, and that such doctrines would be maintained by them, and, therefore, lest his own example in using alcoholic liquor, the force of the miracle which he wrought to produce alcoholic liquor, and the commandment which he gave to his disciples to use alcoholic liquor, if it was offered unto them, should all prove ineffectual to guard you against this error, he ordains the use of this very liquor as one of the symbols in the celebration of the most solemn ordinance of the church. Here then the two systems come directly into collision, and one or other must give way.

Has it not been gravely suggested that the commandment of the Saviour, even in this instance, should give place to the commandments of men? Have they not represented the cup containing intoxicating liquors, as the cup of death and damnation? Have they not called upon Ministers and Christians to banish it for ever from the churches of the living God? Have they not issued their mandate that entire abstinence be written in capitals over the door of every church? I would ask, you, then, how the absolutes can possibly obey the commandment of the Lord, in commemorating his dying love, without being guilty of direct inconsistency? How can the ministers of religion who are members of this society, put into the hand of the communicant, when seated at the table of the Lord, the cup which they have so often denominated the cup of damnation? How can these men consistently bring into the sanctuary what they have called upon all christians to banish from the church of the living God? How can these men who have enjoined entire abstinence to be written over the door of

every church, command alcoholic liquor to be brought within the sanctuary, and placed upon the table of the Lord?

These questions may appear to you involving difficulties which human wisdom cannot surmount. But have you never read so much as this, that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light? Have you never read what the absolutes have done, and are still doing in this matter? Do you not know, or have you never heard, that they have substituted coloured water in the place of wine, in this holy ordinance, thus making their practice consistent with their declarations? Have you never read, or have you never heard, that the champions of this society maintain, that it is better the cup of the Lord should be discarded from his table, than that one jot, or one tittle of the temperance plan should fail of being carried into full effect? Have you never read, or have you never heard, that through the influence of this Society, many, when seated at the Lord's table, have passed with trembling hand, the cup of blessing untasted, viewing it in the light they had been taught to view it, viz as the cup of death and damnation? Have you never read, or have you never heard, that the disciple of Jesus, in connection with this society, now receives the communion cup only by a special act of grace on the part of this society, which has been lately promulgated to the world? Does not this circumstance prove satisfactorily the pernicious tendency of the Temperance Society, that one of its natural consequences is to set aside the most holy ordinance of the gospel of our salvation, and to ingraft upon its stock, the doctrines and the commandments of men. Thus the authority of the Temperance Society has exalted itself

above all that is called God, and rendered null and void the commandments of heaven, unless sanctioned by the stamp of their authority, and the seal of their approbation. But in all things, divine and human. the less authority is sanctioned by the greater; consequently, the absolutes who have presumptuously granted their permission to use wine in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, have assumed to themselves an authority, superior to the authority of him by whom that holy ordinance was at first instituted, that is, they have elevated themselves above him to whom God has given all power in heaven and in earth. This very act of grace, then, on their part, proves them to be the enemies of God and man, and adverse to all that is holy, just, and true.

Do you for one moment suppose that the ever blessed Redeemer of our guilty race, would have commanded his followers to commemorate the shedding of his blood for the remission of sins, by drinking alcoholic liquors, had the use of those liquors been in themselves an immorality. If it were possible to prove that the sacred volume countenanced immorality in any manner or way whatever, it could no longer be held up as a rule for your conduct. However strange it may appear to the absolutes, I cannot help informing them, that there is good reason to believe that the Saviour used alcoholic liquor even after his resurrection from the dead. Matthew xxvi. 29, the Saviour remarked to his disciples, when he gave them the cup at the institution of the sacrament of the supper, "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my father's kingdom," or, as Mark expresses it, "in the kingdom of God"; or as Luke expresses it, "until the kingdom of God shall come."

Also, in the same chapter of Luke's Gospel, 29th and 30th verses, the Saviour says to his disciples, "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. We do not find it mentioned expressly in the Gospels, that the Saviour did drink wine with his disciples between his resurrection and ascension. But in Luke, xxiv. 30, we find him eating with two of his disciples, at the village of Emmaus. And in the same chapter, 41, 42, 43 verses, it is said, "And while they yet believed not for joy and wonder, he said unto them have ye here any meat, and they gave him a piece of a broiled fish and of an honey comb, and he took it and did eat before them. Again, we find him dining with a party of his disciples who had gone a fishing. John xxi. 12, 13, 15, "Jesus saith unto them come and dine. And none of them durst ask him, who art thou ? knowing that it was the Lord. Jesus then cometh, and taketh bread, and giveth them, and fish likewise. So when they had dined, Jesus saith unto Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" &c. We thus find that the Saviour did eat three times in the presence of his disciples after his resurrection from the dead, and is it not reasonable to suppose that he did, on one or more of these occasions, fulfil his pledge of drinking wine with them ?

But I am afraid the absolutes have been too long engaged in dealing out conclusions from false premises to their friends, to admit of sound conclusions from reasonable premises, in such an important matter as this. Lest they should be horrified at the bare supposition that the risen Saviour used alcoholic liquor, and since I promised to deal with them only upon scripture authority, I will yield this particular point to them,

if the following quotation does not bear out the supposition I have made. Acts of the Apostles, x, 40, 41, where Peter in his address to Cornelius and his friends, says, "Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly, not unto all the people, but unto witnesses, chosen before of God, even unto us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." This appears to be satisfactory evidence of the Saviour's pledge to his apostles having been fulfilled. The word of God was given by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the third person in the Godhead, and therefore can neither countenance immorality, nor contradict itself. This being admitted by all christians, and having now brought before you so many direct passages from that infallible standard, some of them countenancing, some encouraging, some commanding, and some perpetuating the use of alcoholic liquors in the church of Christ, you may, therefore, without fear of contradiction, maintain that the doctrine of absolute abstinence from alcoholic liquors has no foundation whatever in the word of God. I said before, and I again repeat it, that there is not in the whole inspired volume a single text supporting the doctrine of the absolutes. If there were, then the Spirit of God has forbidden what the Son of God has practised in his own person, and perpetrated in his church, thus making God inconsistent with himself, which is utterly, awfully false.

The following corollaries follow from this demonstration : first, that the use of alcoholic liquor is neither an immorality nor a violation of the will of God ; second, that the farmer, who supplies the materials—the distiller, who converts these materials into alcoholic liquors—the dealer, who serves them out to the public—and the consumer who uses them in moderation, may all be christians, and carry on their respective departments in this process, without the necessity of thereby

contracting moral defilement ; third, that the use of alcoholic liquor is established in the church till the second coming of Christ ; fourth, that the whole spirit, as well as the plain precept of the word of God, supports the use of alcoholic liquors ; and fifth, that the doctrine taught by the absolutes has no foundation whatever in the word of God, but leads directly to the most detestable heresy.

LECTURE IV.

THE BEARING OF THE ABSOLUTES CAUSE ON THE CHRISTIAN DUTY OF HOSPITALITY.

We come now to consider the bearing of the absolute cause upon the christian duty of hospitality. In order to set this subject clearly before you, I shall make a few quotations from the T. B., which bear immediately upon it, and contrast them with the good old standard, the Scriptures of truth.

T. B. Address on the effects of ardent spirits, page 4, we find it written thus : “ I will begin with the infant, and I may say he is born into rum. At his birth, according to custom, a quantity of ardent spirits is provided ; they are thought to be as necessary as any thing else. They are considered as indispensable as if the child could not be born without them. The father treats his friends and his household, and the mother partakes with the rest. The infant is fed with them, as if he could not know the good things he is heir to, without a taste of ardent spirits. In most families,

In Luke, v, 29, 30, we find the Saviour after calling Levi, feasting with him, along with a great company, and the Pharisees accusing the disciples for eating and drinking with publicans and sinners. It was not for eating and drinking they were blamed, but for associating in a friendly manner with those whom they considered worthless. In Luke xiv, 1, we find the Saviour dining with a Pharisee on the Sabbath day, and from the seventh verse it appears there was a regularly invited party on the occasion. Thus we find the Son of Man, who was also Lord of the Sabbath, countenancing dinner parties even on that day. However much christians may be disposed to blame such things, and however frequently they may really be a profanation of the Sabbath, still we cannot deny, that they may both be given and attended, without any immorality, otherwise the Saviour would not have countenanced them. In verses 13 and 14, of this chapter, we find the following instruction :—"When thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind ; and thou shalt be blessed ; for they cannot recompense thee ; and thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Solomon says, in Eccl. x, 9—"A feast is made for laughter, and wine maketh merry." Our Saviour then, in this passage, not only countenances conviviality, accompanied with the use of alcoholic liquors, but in the most unequivocal manner pronounces that those shall be blessed, who invite to their feasts the poor and the despised, and pledges himself to recompense them at the resurrection of the just. And shall short-sighted, ignorant man, then, presumptuously condemn what Christ the Lord has sanctioned ; or, dare to consign those to destruction whom the great judge of all has thus openly declared that he will publicly honour before an assembled world, and in the presence of the angels of God ? It would really appear that the absolutes do not know the will of Him whom they call their Master, nor

yet what manner of spirit they are of. In Luke's gospel, xix, 5, 6, 7, we find the Saviour with Zaccheus, the chief among the publicans, and in John xii, 1, 2, we find him in Bethany supping with Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead; and in Mark, xiv, 3, we find him dining in Bethany with Simon the leper, three days before his crucifixion. We have thus the example of the Saviour frequently attending feasts along with his disciples, and eating and drinking both with the Pharisees and with the Publicans. What higher authority do we require than this, or what higher can we have?

The apostles, also, in imitation of their master, inculcate hospitality. In the epistle to the Romans, xii, 13, the apostle classes hospitality among the christian virtues. Again in 1 Tim. iii, 2, the same apostle tells us that a bishop must be given to hospitality; and again, in Titus i, 8, he says that a bishop must be a lover of hospitality. The apostle Peter, in his 1st epistle, iv, 9, 10, also commands christians generally to "Use hospitality one to another without grudging. As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God."

My friends, when we have made up our minds to oppose the doctrines taught by the example of the Patriarchs, and by the precepts and the example of the Apostles of our Lord, and by the precepts and example of our Lord and Saviour himself, and to prefer the commandments of men, to the commandments of the living God, then, and not till then, can we subscribe the creed of the absolutes.

The efforts of this society appear to be fulfilling the prediction of the apostle Paul in 2 Tim. iv, 3, 4, which saith; "The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine;

but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears, and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." "The experience of the church, in every age, proves that men may be found to teach any doctrine, however heretical ; and our own personal experience proves that abundance, who call themselves christians, have been found to teach this favourite doctrine of absolute abstinence, which is no where countenanced in the inspired volume, and which is directly contrary, not only to its spirit, but also to its plainest and most positive injunctions.

In the T. B. address to young men of the United States on temperance, pages 12 and 13, it is written—" Entire abstinence from the drink of drunkards is the parents *only* plan in training up children. However novel the assertion to some, it can be easily shown, that the example of all who use ardent spirits, except as they use prescribed medicine, is in the scale of intemperance. It is to the honour given to the degrading cup, by those who can drink without what is considered excess, that we must ascribe, in a great degree, the first seduction of all who receive the ultimate wages of intemperance."

In answer to this quotation, I have only to remark, that the drink of the drunkard has, in all ages, likewise been the drink of the saint ; it was also the drink of the Saviour. God has not, in this world, provided any separate meat or drink for the nourishment and support of the bodies of saints and sinners. The novel assertion, in this question, cannot possibly be shown to be true, without ranking the Saviour and the saints, in all ages, among the number of the intemperate. To the honour given to the degrading cup, by those who drink without excess, is here attributed the seduction and ruin of the intemperate.—

But who ever honoured this cup so highly as the Saviour of the world ? He wrought his first miracle to make it overflow abundantly, after it had been drained to the bottom by a convivial party where he was a guest ; he used it himself during his life on earth, and after his resurrection from the dead, and has left it in his church to remain through all generations as one of the symbols of his dying love. Is not this then ascribing the first seduction and the ultimate ruin of the drunkard to the Saviour of sinners ? So directly is this the conviction of the absolutes, that many of them have set aside the use of wine in the sacrament of the supper, while others pass the cup untasted when sealed at the Lord's table, as an accursed thing, thus openly insulting the wisdom of the Saviour, while they profess publicly to celebrate his love.

In the T. B., Dr. Sewall's address, it is written, " It is perhaps difficult to determine in what way intemperance first manifests its influence on the moral powers, so variously does it affect different individuals. Were I to speak from my own observation, I should say that it first appears in an alienation of those kind and tender sympathies which bind a man to his family and friends ; those lively sensibilities which enable him to participate in the joys and sorrows of those around him.— The social affections lose their fullness and tenderness, the conscience its power, the heart its sensibility, till all that was once lovely, and rendered him the joy and the idol of his friends, retires and leaves him to the dominion of the appetites and passions of the brute. Religious enjoyment, if ever he possessed any, declines as the emotions excited by ardent spirits arise, &c."

I have only to remark that, if the Doctor means what he has here said as applicable to the drunkard, we are ready to

subscribe to its truth. But if he means it to apply to the use, as well as to the abuse of alcoholic liquor, (for we maintain there is a use without the abuse), we have only to say that he is either wrong in his assertion or else the Bible is not true.

In the T. B., scripture arguments for temperance, page 16, it is written, "And now, does any one still enquire what more he can do for temperance than pledge his example?—What more, let it be asked, was you once doing to aid intemperance? Did you not, with kind looks and bland words, pass the cup to your child, your friend, your neighbour, your servant, and even to the stranger at the inn or at your door? Did you not, with the fruits of your industry, aid the distiller, the retailer, and say to all around, drink, drink, though you knew there was death in the cup? And have not some, perhaps many, been thus ruined by your instrumentality?"

In this quotation there appears such a direct contradiction to the bible, that it would almost seem to have been written as a satire upon the word of God. Are not the kind looks, the bland words, and the manner of passing the cup to children, friends, neighbours, servants and strangers, which are here reprobated, and held up to scorn and contempt, the very conduct which the scriptures recommend? Did not the Saviour, with kind looks and bland words, pass the cup to his disciples? And does he not say to his church in all ages, "Eat, O friends, drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved?" Until these, and many other passages which have already been quoted, are discarded from the bible—in short, until we have a new revelation of the will of God, such doctrines as are here inculcated, cannot for one moment be entertained by any but the ignorant and the unbelieving. Such productions as that from which this quotation

is taken, do more real injury to the cause of christianity, than all the distillers, spirit-dealers, and spirit-consumers on the face of the earth. It is, in short, nothing less than a wilful and deliberate misrepresentation of the word of God. But, as we shall have occasion to examine this production more minutely in one of its bearings, we shall leave it at present.

In the National Circular, pages 15, 16, it is thus written, "There is another reason why all women should unite in temperance societies. More than an hundred thousand of the lovely daughters of the last generation, were doomed to the tremendous curse of having drunken husbands, and rearing their little ones under the blasting, withering influence of drunken fathers. But there is no need of it. Let the fathers, and mothers, and brothers, and sisters of this generation all cease the use of intoxicating drinks, and unite their influence in temperance societies, and the daughters of the next generation, and of all future generations practising upon this plan, shall be for ever free. And there is another reason why women should belong to temperance societies. Multitudes of the last generation were made drunkards by the customs of society. Though the appetite for ardent spirits is not natural, and would never exist, were it not formed by the use of it, it has been formed not only in the cradle, but in many cases has been coeval almost with life itself. Even the mother, when her infant was unwell, and she did not wish during the night to be kept awake with it, drank the poison herself; and the helpless babe slept like a drunkard for a similar reason, and the drunkard's appetite was formed there; and as if that were not enough, as it lay in the cradle, she fed it with a *tea-spoon*, and the drunkard's appetite was strengthened,

and no sooner could it walk, than the father after he had been drinking, gave it the *bottom of the glass*, sweetened in the most *enchanted* manner, and the drunkard's appetite was confirmed. And *before* the heedless youth had *hardly* entered upon *manhood*, he *stumbled into the drunkard's grave*, was covered up, and his destroyers were glad to forget him. But there is no need of it. Let the custom of society be changed, and each individual unite with others, to taste not, touch not, and handle not the abominable thing, and the evil will be done away. Generations yet unborn to all future ages, saved by simply ceasing to do evil and learning to do well, will rise up and call you blessed."

The first reason here quoted why all women should unite in temperance societies is indeed plausible, and were the cure prescribed not contrary to the word of God, it would certainly be worth making the experiment upon the most extended scale.¹ But we have too high an opinion of ladies in general to suppose that any considerable number of them would consent to be relieved even from that heaviest of earthly curses—a drunken partner—at the awful expense of trampling the authority of God's word under their feet. Often have they sought, and not in vain, for consolation in that word, when all worldly comforts and worldly comforters had forsaken them. And would they sacrifice a tried and trusty friend, that they might grasp at the doubtful promises of a fawning stranger. It cannot be denied that many of them have signed the temperance pledge, but with them in most cases it has been the sin of ignorance. It has come to them recommended by the approval not only of the learned and influential among their lay friends, but also bearing the sanction of those whom they regarded as the ministers and faithful servants of

the Lord Jesus Christ. Besides, a married lady is not at liberty, according to the law of God, (Numbers, xxx,) either to make a vow or a pledge without the consent of her husband, either expressed or understood.

The second reason here quoted is a barefaced insult upon the female character, as well as upon the word of God. Females are expressly authorised in scripture, to use alcoholic drink, and if at any time it is more necessary than another, it is at that very time when they are more especially debared from it, by the hard-hearted and unsympathising absolutes. In all such cases the use of it is innocent, and in very many cases, where the mother is delicate, it is almost indispensable ; and yet they dare not taste a single drop to support their declining strength, or to invigorate their emaciated frame. Well may it be said of the absolutes, that "their tender mercies are cruel." Was there ever a more unjust insinuation thrown out against the female character than this, that they, in order to get rid of trouble from a sick and helpless babe during the night, drink alcoholic liquor with the view of intoxicating the child? The man who judges thus must be devoid of honesty or observation, if not of both. Did the author of the National Circular not know that all the tenderest sympathies of the female heart are alive towards their helpless offspring? They know by the experience of many generations, handed down from mother to daughter, that what is here reprobated, cures many of the early complaints of children ; and the draught which is here attributed to the mother's indifference, is in reality taken expressly for the benefit of the child. Mothers are thus held up to ridicule, as unsympathising and cruel, for administering to their babes, a medicine which so quickly and so effectually removes many of

their early complaints. It is said here, as well as in many other passages of the T. B., that the appetite for alcoholic liquors is not natural. But this, like many of their other axioms, is by no means self evident. As this is a fundamental doctrine of the absolutes' creed, especially where ladies are in the question, I shall for their sakes pause a little and shew its fallacy. Is there a man among the absolutes, who, before he ceased to sip a little, has not observed flies and various other insects congregating around the intoxicating draft, and risking their very lives for the pleasure of sipping a little along with him? Who perverted their appetites? Perhaps it may be said that their mothers had used it, and thus instilled into them an unnatural taste. But let the absolutes make the experiment, let them retire into the bosom of the remotest forest, far beyond the haunts of men, and let them spread out the intoxicating liquors, and there, too, they will soon find their table furnished with guests, and showing evident symptoms that they have a taste for alcoholic liquors. And who will say that an appetite, shewing itself under such different circumstances, is not natural? Let the absolutes also make the experiment, by setting a little milk-punch before their cats, dogs, swine, &c., and they will at once find that they too have an appetite for sipping a little. But will any man say that this appetite arises from their mothers having used such drink?—Will any man, who is a christian, dare to affirm that the Saviour ever indulged in the gratification of any unnatural appetite, and yet it is certain that he used alcoholic liquors?—But, was not the Saviour holy, harmless, undefiled and separated from sinners, and may not the mothers, in the spiritual Israel, imitate his example in this respect, without either contracting moral defilement themselves, or thereby entailing moral defilement upon their children? Let not the ladies even blush at the accusations of the absolutes, while they find the

Saviour united with them in the same condemnation ; for it is said in the last sentence of this quotation, that “ Generations yet unborn, to all future ages, saved by simply ceasing to do *evil*, and learning to do well, will rise up and call you blessed.” This is evidently something more than an insinuation, that the use of alcoholic liquor is an evil or a sin, as the scripture quotation implies. But if so, then, according to the most legitimate logical deduction, the Saviour, who also used it, was a sinner. If your hearts revolt at such an idea, then learn to look upon every advocate of absolute abstinence with an eye of suspicion, and distrust.

Before leaving this head, I claim your indulgence for one moment, while I look into this tirade against the ladies, in a critical point of view. It is said, the infant was unwell, the mother took a little strong drink, and the child was cured, and slept soundly. This seems rather an argument for the use of alcoholic drink. But mark the sequel ; the drunkard’s appetite was formed there. It is evident that the author of this pamphlet must have been an M. D., who, mourning over the loss of many a fee by this simple cure, starts the bug-bear of *forming* the drunkard’s appetite, to frighten mothers, that he might have more opportunities of *forming* the Doctor’s bill.— Again, as it lay in the cradle she fed it with a *tea-spoon*, and the drunkard’s appetite was strengthened. We are led to conclude, from the way in which this sentence is expressed, that *tea-spoons* form the first food of the infant, but how far this regimen may tend to strengthen the drunkard’s appetite is not easy to determine, however, it is probable that such solid food may require a large quantity of fluids to render it soluble.— Let mothers feed their children with catnip, and then, although they all die of colic, you will be innocent. But what part does the father act in this tragedy ? Why, no sooner could

the child walk than the father, after he had been drinking, gave it the *bottom of the glass, sweetened in the most enchanting manner*, and the drunkard's appetite was confirmed. If the author of this sentence meant that the child did eat the bottom of the glass, there can be little doubt that such food would irritate the intestines, exciting a greater or less degree of inflammation and fever, and would naturally produce thirst.--- But I have, perhaps, misapprehended the meaning of our author, for he says the bottom of the glass was sweetened in the most enchanting manner. It would rather appear from this, that the father had been in a playful humour, for every person who understands the English language knows that it is with music only that an instrument can be sweetened to produce any thing like enchantment. Had the author meant that it was sugar, or molasses, or honey, &c., which was used, he would have employed the word enticing, not enchanting.--- But it is well known that glasses, under dexterous management, do actually produce something like enchanting music. But it is not easy to comprehend how any propensity to drunkenness should arise from such a playful, and apparently innocent pastime of the parent. But still we are told, gravely told, that in this manner the drunkard's appetite was confirmed.--- "And *before* the heedless youth had *hardly* entered upon manhood, he stumbled into the drunkard's grave, and was covered up, and his destroyers were glad to forget him." The plain English of this sentence is, that at some period previous to the time when this youth, after being fed with *tea-spoons* and the bottoms of glasses, entered upon manhood, he had the misfortune to stumble into a grave which had been opened for the remains of *the* drunkard well known in the neighbourhood. This was an accident, and rendered truly alarming, from his having been covered up in the grave. But we are not told who covered him up, neither are we told by what means he

got out of this perilous situation, but it is evident he did get out, for this happened before he arrived at manhood, and yet he did attain to this period of life. His destroyers were glad to forget him. But who were his destroyers? You cannot suppose his parents were, for they appear to have possessed the feelings of parents? You cannot suppose the *tea-spoon*, the *bottom of the glass*, and the *drunkard's grave* were so, for they had no memory? Neither were those who covered him up in the grave his destroyers, for it is evident he survived this accident and attained to manhood? But as it is the criticism of principle, and not of language, in which I am engaged, I shall follow this subject no farther.

In the last sentence of the quotation from T. B. it is said, "let the customs of society be changed, and each individual unite with others, to touch not, taste not, and handle not," the abominable thing, and the evil will be done away. I have already shown that the customs of society, here alluded to, are sanctioned by the highest authority, and have been almost universal since the earliest ages, and must, therefore, be founded in the very constitution of our nature, and cannot be changed without setting at nought the commandments which have been quoted from scripture on this head. But suppose this custom to be done away, and what would be the result? Where will you find hospitality if you banish from society that very element which God has expressly given to cheer our hearts and enliven our intercourse. The use of alcoholic liquor opens our heart to our friends, and extends the arm to welcome the stranger. I trust I have now proved that the system adopted by the absolutes is directly contrary to the scripture doctrine of hospitality, and, therefore, can claim no higher origin than a commandment of sordid men.

Jews specially commanded to eat, and drink, and rejoice when they assembled before the Lord to keep their appointed feasts, and expressly permitted to drink on these occasions, either wine, or strong drink, or whatever their soul lusted after. Were they not commanded in the law of Moses, to bring the strong wine of their drink offering with every sacrifice, that the Priests, and the Levites might be supplied with that article abundantly, and they were permitted to use it, excepting when they went into the tabernacle of the congregation. There can be no doubt from many passages in the New Testament that the Saviour himself used such drink as was common among the Jews, at the time when he was personally with them. He also commanded his Apostles to use it, when he said "Into whatever house ye enter, in the same house remain eating and drinking such things as they give." Besides he commanded the use of it to remain in the church to the end of the world, whenever his people assemble to commemorate his dying love. Paul also commanded his beloved Timothy to drink moderately, when he said drink no longer water, but use a little wine &c. And were all these things done, that the saving influences of the Holy Spirit, might be excluded from the church, and the people of God. Such a thought is too revolting for the mind of the christian to dwell on.

In the last quoted book, page 8, it is written "far more than thirty thousand are annually slain by moderate drinking." That far more than thirty thousand individuals are annually slain by moderate drinking in the United States of America, does certainly appear alarming to those who do not know how this amount is made up. Every individual who does not subscribe the temperance pledge is sus-

pected to be intemperate, and no sooner is he known to take a single glass of alcoholic liquor than he is entered upon the list of the intemperate, and when he dies, his name stands upon the roll of those who have died from the effects of alcoholic liquor. But a roll taken upon such data, can scarcely be considered as an authentic account of the effects of intemperance.

T. B. Monster destroyed, page 11, it is written " Good says the Demon (viz. Intemperance) growling in his den, that is all I want. The doctrine of prudent use is the basis of my kingdom." We have an objection to this doctrine, and the answer to it in these words, page 12, " prudent use can do no harm, and prudent use does not keep intemperance in the land. These are the strong holds of the Monster, and these must be broken down. Let me ask, where is the doctrine of the prudent use of alcoholic liquors taught, and by whom?" The Reverend author of this book, could not be ignorant, if he had studied his Bible, as we cannot doubt he did, that the doctrine of the prudent use of alcoholic liquor was taught in that holy Book, and taught too by the Spirit of God himself. This supposed which we cannot reasonably deny, it follows that he considered the Bible to be the basis of intemperance, the strong hold of the Monster drunkenness, and consequently that it must be broken down. In short the Bible is now the only barrier against the leaven of absolutism, spreading its deadly influence into all the springs of civilized society. Could they remove this stumbling-block out of their way, they might carry their standard with a high hand, lording it over the consciences of the simple, but so long as it is not removed they can never finally triumph. I am aware it may still be said that these are only assertions affording no proof

the animal spirits, and of making glad the heart of man, as well as other alcoholic liquors. But it is because they possess this very virtue in a high degree, and at a price which brings them within the reach of every one, which caused our author to consign them to everlasting execration, and denounce them as the greatest curse that ever God inflicted on the world. In Psalm civ. 15, God claims to himself the honour of causing the earth to bring forth wine, that maketh glad the heart of man. He too brings forth from the same store-house all the other varieties of alcoholic liquors, and for the same purpose. If it is an honour to God to give wine to make glad the heart of man, is it a dishonour for him to give other alcoholic liquors, which have a still more powerful tendency to produce the same effect, and at a price which excludes none from occasionally enjoying this gift of his bounty? All the gifts of God's providence are good when properly used, and therefore should call forth our gratitude to him, but they are all hurtful, and degrading to those by whom they are abused, and therefore call forth the exercise of our reason, and our judgment to direct us in the enjoyment of them. But if this exercise of the faculties which God has given us is neglected, and his gifts are abused, no man in the use of his reason would on that account call the gifts of his God an accursed thing. If ardent spirits are really what the absolutes represent them to be, a very destructive poison and the greatest curse that ever God inflicted on the world, it must be evident to every one that the execration imprecated in the above quotation is applicable to God, and not to the ardent spirits. To bring the truth of this view clearly before your minds—suppose that a skilful Physician, knowing well the deleterious properties of arsenic, should give a quantity of it to a child in a present, saying, that it was of the very best quality, and that this child should take some of the arsenic into its stomach, and

thereby destroy its life, you would never once think of consigning the arsenic to universal and everlasting execration, but the Physician by whom it was given. In like manner the curse so heavily imprecated in the above quotation, is applicable not to the ardent spirits, if they are what the absolutes represent them, but to him by whom they are given, that is, to God. It is our duty to be on our guard against all, whether individuals, or societies, who would touch us either by their precepts or example, to hold in execration, either the God of providence, or the gifts of providence.

T. B. Effects of Ardent Spirits, page 17, it is written, "He who advises men not to drink to excess, may lop off the branches: he who advises them to drink only on certain occasions, may fell the trunk; but he who tells them not to drink at all, strikes and digs deep for the roots of the hideous vice of intemperance; and this is the only course to pursue."

It is plain from this sentence that the absolutes take great credit to themselves for the depth of their wisdom, in having devised a scheme for banishing intemperance from the earth, which God had never promulgated, namely, by digging deep and removing every fibre that can produce drunkenness. We would gladly have passed in silence this arrogance on the part of the absolutes, had they not exalted their wisdom, above the wisdom of God. He who advises men not to drink to excess is none other than God. Throughout the whole of the sacred volume wherever this subject is introduced, not to drink to excess is all that God enjoins on man in ordinary cases, and the neglect of this injunction incurs heavy displeasure. But the absolutes say, this is only to lop off the branches, thus making their own wisdom and benevolence, superior to the wisdom and benevolence of God. But since

God has only prohibited the excess, thereby sanctioning the use, I would ask the absolutes upon what authority they found their system of super-divine perfection, calling upon men to renounce what God has granted them permission to use?—One thing is evident, that it is not founded on the word of God, and therefore cannot tend to his glory.

T. B. Appeal to American Youth on Temperance, p. 3, it is written, "Thus it was said of him, who was honored to announce the Saviour's advent, 'he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink.' In the view of omniscience, then, true greatness is associated with entire abstinence from this artificial stimulus."

It may perhaps appear captious to object to any part of the above quotation, still we cannot pass it over in silence. We readily acknowledge the greatness of John, for we have the authority of the Saviour himself, Matt. xi, 11, that "among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist." We have also the authority of scripture that he drank neither wine nor strong drink. But we have, also, the declaration of John himself regarding Christ's greatness, when he says in John's gospel i, 27, "Whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose." We have, also, the corroborating evidence of the Saviour, that "he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John the Baptist." How infinitely greater then is Jesus, whom all the kingdom of heaven worship and obey, than John, who was less than the least in the kingdom of heaven. Was not Christ Jesus then, and not John the Baptist, the individual in the above quotation from the T. B., who was truly great? But Christ used alcoholic liquor, therefore "in the view of omniscience, true greatness is associated with the use of alcoholic liquor, and not with entire abstinence. Is it

when

not an insult to Christ, that his example should, not only be concealed as if polluted, but that the example of one so infinitely inferior, and who himself was not even a christian, should be held up for the imitation of christians, in preference to his holy and perfect example ? Besides our case is not at all analogous to that of John the Baptist ; for God commanded before he was conceived in the womb, that he should neither drink wine nor strong drink, his abstinence was indeed a matter of individual and positive duty, not of choice. I would ask the absolutes then if the Rev. Author of the above quotation, deals honestly with the Scriptures, and with the world, even themselves being judge ? But dishonest dealing with the word of God is even worse than the traffic in ardent spirits.

T. B. Monster Destroyed, p. 9, it is written, “ We talk of our religion, and weep over the delusions of the false prophet, and the horrors of Juggernaut, but a more deceitful prophet is in our churches than Mahomet, and a more deadly idol than Juggernaut, rolls through our land, crushing beneath its wheels our sons, and our daughters.”

This sentence is too revolting to enable us to believe, that the author of it, expressed what he himself meant. We as christians do mourn over the delusions of the false prophet, and also, over the absolutes, who so strenuously endeavour to ingraft one of his peculiar doctrines, upon the gospel of Christ ; but that there is in the christian church a more deceitful prophet than Mahomet, we utterly deny. Christ Jesus is the prophet, as well as the priest, and king of the christian church ; and is he who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, more deceitful than Mahomet the impostor. True it is, that Christ not only used alcoholic liquor himself, but also perpetuated the use of it in his church, from which Mahomet debarred

his followers, but we dare not on that account to make a comparison between the basest of men, and the Lord of glory, or having made the comparison, we dare not give the preference to him, in whom there was no truth, over the blessed Jesus, who is the way, the truth, and the life, without being guilty of the grossest blasphemy.

T. B. Arguments against ardent spirits, p. 23, "Again : I ask the men whom I am addressing, (viz : distillers, retailers and farmers) how they reconcile their manufacture, and sale of spirits, with another command of the bible ? ' Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness.' True, this applies most emphatically to the retailer of spirits ; but what would the retailer do if there were no distillery : and what could the distiller do if the farmer withheld the materials ? All these men are engaged directly or indirectly in giving their neighbours drink."

Is it not strange how the absolutes should make the passage of scripture in this quotation to be directly applicable to distillers, retailers, and farmers, who are engaged in the production, and distribution of ardent spirits, since they so frequently maintain, that not one word is said in the bible, regarding ardent spirits ? But giving up this objection, we would remark, that this passage of scripture, does not implicate, as a matter of necessity, any of those who are hereby represented in the process of production, and supply of ardent spirits. It applies directly, and only to those, whatever their occupation may be, who, under the cloak of friendship or hospitality, or any other pretext whatever, urge their neighbors to excess in alcoholic liquor, that they may gain some undue advantage over them and thereby injure them in their property, or in their persons,

or in their reputation. But it is to another part of the quotation that your attention is more particularly required. It is said, "What could the retailer do, if there were no distillery; and what could the distiller do, if the farmer withheld the materials?" You must see clearly from this, that the farmer, without whose aid the whole process must stop, is pointed at both here and in other parts of the T. B., as the most culpable of the whole. You are all aware, when the farmer has thrown his grain into the earth, he can do no more. It is God who blesseth the springing thereof, it is God who giveth the increase, He, therefore, according to the above reasoning, is the most culpable of all, and consequently the woe in the above quotation is most applicable to him by whom it was pronounced. This is evidently pointing to God as the author of sin, which is insulting to Him.

T. B. Scripture arguments for Temperance, page 6, it is written, "The use of this liquor is inconsistent with the proper influence of christian example. The Saviour says, 'let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father *who* is in Heaven.' But, will men esteem christians the more for drinking, and thus be led to glorify God on their behalf? Or, will the Saviour praise them for this, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe? Rather, will not their drinking lead some to excess, and thus sully the Creator's work?"

In reply to this quotation we have to remark, that if christians were commanded by their King and Head, to abstain from the use of alcoholic liquors, then the use of them in any manner, in any shape, or in any quantity, is directly and immutably inconsistent with the proper influence of christian example. But having pointed out so many falsehoods and so

many errors in the T. B., we have yet to learn whether the originators of the temperance scheme, and their lineal descendants, the absolutes, are really christians, and influenced by the example and commandments of Him whose name they have assumed. While we are ignorant of this, we may oppose their views, and act contrary to their mandates, and yet have no evidence that our use of alcoholic liquors is at all inconsistent with the proper influence of christian example. The passage of scripture here quoted, if we have any understanding in the word of God, shows that they have either no foundation whatever in that holy word for the scheme which they are pushing forward at all hazards, or that they have been culpably negligent in their selection of a passage to support their sweeping assertion. The passage quoted is the Saviour's command to his disciples, not to those whom he had more formally called, but to all who believed in him and followed him as the Saviour. What light then did he call upon them to show to the world, but that very light which they had seen in him? That firm and determined zeal for the glory of God which he had shown before them, and which no opposition could shake; that unceremonious association with all who believed in him, which he had observed; and that participation in the bounties of providence, which should be set before them, in whatever society they should be placed, as he himself had set them the example. In short, the whole walk, conduct, and conversation of Jesus, in so far as frail man can imitate him, was the light which they were enjoined to show forth before men. Wherefore, every unprejudiced man will esteem christians the more for drinking, while they do so according to the example, and in obedience to the commandment of our Lord.

Are we not commanded to rejoice with them that do rejoice, as well as to weep with them that weep? Suppose we

were to go to the house of mourning, and while there, to show no evidence whatever of sympathising with them in their distress, would this be imitating the example of Jesus, at the tomb of Lazarus? would this lead them to glorify God on our behalf? Again, if we were to go to the house of rejoicing, and while there, morosely refuse to partake with them of those things which God has given expressly to make glad the heart of man, and thus throw gloom over their joy, would this lead them to glorify God on our behalf? No. It would induce men who had no practical experience of godliness, to look upon christianity as inconsistent with the innocent enjoyment of the present life, and thus lead them to shun the company, and despise the professions of the christian. There is an insinuation in this quotation, that the Saviour will not approve of his followers when he comes in his glory to judge the world, who imitate his example in this respect. But the Holy Saviour will never disapprove of his people for having imitated his example, nor yet for having obeyed his precept. He is neither mutable in his counsels nor changeable in his purposes. He will not only approve of others for giving us what is here condemned, but he will also approve of us the more, for giving it to others who believe in his name. This is evident, from the very reasons which he assigns for the sentence of approbation which he is to pronounce on his people, when he comes as alluded to in the above quotation. The absolutes are therefore professing themselves to be wiser than their Judge, and presuming to dictate to him, other grounds for regulating his discussions, than those which he himself has already laid down. Is this, then, not an insult to him who is infinite in wisdom, and immutable in all his decrees? To say then, that the Lord's people, by doing what their Lord himself has taught, both by his precepts and by his example, will lead others to sully his work, is a reflection upon himself, not upon his people.

Is he infinite in wisdom, and yet did he not foresee this, and is he infinite in benevolence, and yet did he not regard this? No higher proof can be obtained of the error and the heresy of the doctrines, and the commandments of men, than their being opposed to the wisdom and perfections, to the example and the precepts of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

LECTURE VI.

SHOWING THAT THE DOCTRINES OF THE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY ARE A DIRECT
INSULT TO THE HOLY ONE OF ISRAEL.

T. B. Scripture arguments for Temperance, page 7, it is written, "The use of ardent spirits is inconsistent with the harmony and brotherly love which Christ requires in his professed followers." He requires them to "love one another with a pure heart fervently;" to "be all of one mind;" to be "of one heart and one soul." But who does not see the utter impossibility of this, if some continue an indulgence which others regard with abhorrence? Since public attention has been turned to this subject, thousands have come to the conviction that drinking distilled liquor is as wicked as well as filthy practice. The most distinguished lights of the church, and all such as peculiarly adorn human nature, decidedly embrace this sentiment. And how can such have any thing like cordiality with those who continue a habit now so extensively viewed with disgust? Ah! the man, however decent, who, in a day like this "will have his glass, *not caring*

whom he offends," *must have it*; but with it he must also "*have his reward.*" For, judging from his fruits, he has nothing of the spirit of Christ, or of Paul. That holy apostle speaking on this very subject of appetite, says, "give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God." And the Saviour says, *whoso shall offend one of these little ones who believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck.*"

That the use of ardent spirits is inconsistent with the harmony and brotherly love which Christ requires in his followers, we deny upon the grounds which have already been adduced. The Saviour's commands regarding brotherly love, unity, and unanimity are also misapplied in this place. What is said here is the same that has been said by the most heretical, and pestilential sects of professing christians, whose doctrines, and practices have disgraced christianity, and human nature itself. But the more objectionable, and the more heretical the tenets are, of those who profess themselves to be christians, the more determinedly do they urge such passages as the above, in order to force men into their cage of fowl birds. It is not easy to conceive how the use of distilled liquors should be considered a wicked, and a filthy practice by any but the absolutes. All who allow the use of wine, thereby allow the use of alcohol. But it is generally admitted that there is much more difficulty in obtaining wine free from adulteration, than ardent spirits, and this difficulty always increases in the direct ratio of the price of the wine above the price of ardent spirits. Still every one knows that it is the alcohol, and not the watery part of the wine which gives it the quality of exhilarating the animal

spirits. Now, if this stimulent can be obtained purer in ardent spirits than in wine, wherein lies the wickedness of using it? And wherein lies the filthiness of the practice? Is it not safer for every individual to mix his alcohol with what quantity of water; and sugar he thinks best, than to take into his stomach a mixture of which he neither knows the ingredients, nor the consequences?

That the most distinguished lights of the church, and all such as particularly adorn human nature decidedly embrace the sentiment, that the use of distilled liquors is a wicked and a filthy practice, is not correct. Those men, in many instances, who have been the most active in pushing forward this scheme are found among those, who, leaving their first faith have embraced the tenets of what is generally called the new light party, and who in not a few instances have brought upon themselves the displeasure and censure of the church by their pernicious doctrines. Shall we say then that men who have been publicly ejected from the church, on account of their heretical doctrines, were its most distinguished lights, and particularly adorned human nature? We know well that such men can have little cordiality with us, even were we to join this society, unless we also became their disciples in all their heresies. But are we to renounce our faith, or any article of it, in order to gain the cordial friendship and love of those whom we believe to be unsound in the faith?

Again, it is said, Ah! the man, however decent, who in a day like this, "will have his glass, *not caring* whom he offends," *must have it*, but with it he must also "have his reward." What is "*the day like this*," to which our author particularly refers? Is it a day of peculiar religious light?

O, no ; the shadows of the morning are yet long in that land. By their own showing, even in the most highly favoured situations, not more than one in four of the population are in any sense members of the christian church, under any denomination. And shall they presume to say that this child of ignorance and error is a proof of superior light ? No. Error has ever been the offspring of ignorance and superstition, not of superior light, and christian attainments.

Judging from his works (says our author) he has none of the Spirit of Christ or of Paul. But did Christ court the cordial friendship of the Jewish doctors, or of the Pharisees, by shunning the company of publicans and sinners ? or did he court their friendship by observing the traditions of the elders, and the commandments of men, which they had engrafted upon the law ? Did Paul endeavour to secure the cordial friendship of the disciples who came to Antioch, and taught the people that they could not be saved by their faith in Christ, unless they were circumcised, and kept the law of Moses, by giving into their views, and adopting their errors ? We have already shown, that the views and the doctrines of the absolutes are contrary to the word of God, consequently, we ought never to attempt securing their cordiality, by adopting their errors. This was never taught by the apostle, nor practised by him. Would the christians at Ephesus have been innocent had they embraced the heresies of the Nicolaitans, in order to escape the charge of deficiency in christian love, and cordiality ? Certainly not ; for Christ approves of them for withstanding, and condemning that heresy.

In reply to the last part of the above quotation, it is worthy of remark, that the words of the Saviour therein used, were applied by way of rebuke, and caution to his disciples against spiritual pride, and teaching them, that true christian greatness consisted in humility, and child like docility. But in the very next verse he says, "Woe unto the world because of offences, for it must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom they come." Let us then enquire by whom the offence has come in this instance, for without this knowledge we know not to whom the Saviour's language is applicable. If the use of alcoholic liquor is an immorality, a violation of the will of God, then it follows as a natural consequence, that those who use it are giving just offence to the church, and thereby incurring the displeasure of the Lord. But if, on the other hand, the use of alcoholic liquor is sanctioned in the word of God, it must follow as an equally natural consequence, that those by whom this use is prohibited are causing this offence, and not those who use it.—That the use of alcoholic liquor is not an immorality, but has received the highest sanction, and is consistent with the highest attainments in the christian life, has already been proved by the whole tenor of scripture, as well as by the example of our Lord and his apostles.—Those, therefore, who prohibit the use of these things as unholy and debasing, cannot be freed from the charge of giving the offence, and consequently exposing themselves to the penalty. But for men to follow their own imaginations, and teach their own commandments, and denounce all who do not imitate their example, are they not thereby insulting the Lord, and provoking him to displeasure?

T. B. Scripture Arguments for Temperance, page 7, it is written, "The use of distilled liquors, in this day of

light, is incompatible with the hope of receiving any general effusion of the Holy Spirit. Christians are allowed to hope for the Holy Spirit to be poured out only in answer to prayer ; and only in answer to true, spiritual, believing prayer. ' If they regard iniquity in their heart, the Lord will not hear them ' If they wilfully and habitually cherish any sin, they cannot have faith, and it is inconsistent to hope that God would show such approbation as to answer their prayers. Nay, is it not most solemn mockery for any to cry, ' Revive thy work, O Lord,' while, by example, they are perhaps seducing thousands to sin ? Indeed, how odious the spectacle of a company assembled, professedly in the name of Christ, and looking toward heaven, but, in this posture of devotion, all breathing forth the foul, fiery element. This is literally offering strange fire before the Lord. And, instead of mercy, I hear His terrible remonstrance, ' Ye are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all day.' I see the lightning of his anger ready to smite such impious mockers. It should never be forgotten that the miserable men whom the Almighty struck dead, when they ' offered strange fire,' were probably excited by liquor, as we infer from the fact, that His command never to taste any thing like strong drink, when about to enter the place of worship, was issued immediately after that awful visitation. O, how, without sin, can His pure spirit be invoked to descend and mingle His holy influences with that spirit which worketh only iniquity and death, and which pollutes the very air we breathe ?"

In answer to the first part of this quotation, in so far as it refers to the day of light, it is only necessary to refer to what was said on that head under the preceding quotation. That the use of distilled liquors are incompatible

with the hope of receiving any general effusion of the Holy Spirit, has been replied to in a former lecture. It is evident, however, that we may both praise and glorify God by the use of these very liquors, otherwise they would have been excepted by the apostle when giving his general injunction, "Whether ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the praise and glory of God." But if it can be used to the praise and glory of God, as we naturally infer from this injunction, it must be evident to every one, that it cannot be regarded as a sin, nor as an iniquity, neither is it inconsistent with believing spiritual prayer, and therefore may be used by the faithful in perfect accordance with the well grounded hope of God's gracious answer to our prayers. Consequently, while using this liquor, and not abusing it, we may cry, "Revive thy work, O Lord," without being guilty of any mockery, nay, even be pouring forth the prayer of faith, from a pious and devotional heart.

Our author says, "Indeed how odious the spectacle of a company assembled, professedly in the name of Christ, and looking toward heaven, but in this posture of devotion, all breathing forth the foul fiery element! This is literally 'offering strange fire before the Lord.'"

You will observe that all this, is directed against the use, not against the abuse of distilled liquors, consequently the company here alluded to, are supposed to have been using, not abusing these things. It does not even suppose that any of their faculties, either bodily or mental, were in the least degree impaired by it. No, nothing more is supposed than this, that their breath discovered what they had been using, Yet in this state of perfect soundness both of body and mind, assembled

In the name of Christ, and looking toward heaven, in a posture of devotion, they are called an odious spectacle, and represented as offering strange fire to the Lord, and bringing down the lightning of God's anger, to smite them as impious mockers. If this is really the case ; then christianity is an inexplicable mystery, and christians are indeed, of all men, the most miserable. Do we look to Jesus as the foundation of our hope, and to his precepts, and to his example, as the rule and guide of our lives, in all we say, and in all we do, and yet by obeying the one, and imitating the other, are we thereby rendering ourselves justly obnoxious to his displeasure ? God forbid.— But did not Jesus himself partake of whatever was set before him by the hospitality of those by whom he was entertained ? Not one word is found in any of the gospels from which we can gather, that he ever objected to, or refused to participate in any of these things. Again, when he sent out his seventy disciples, he gave them a commandment to eat and drink whatever was set before them. But this commandment was given not so much for their sakes, (as has already been shown,) as for those who should live in other ages of his church. He knew well, (for he knew all things,) that in the day in which we live, distilled liquors would be offered to his servants, and to his people, and if this when taken into the stomach, was to pollute them, like the spirit of the devil operating in their hearts, and breathing itself forth, in malice and envy, evil speaking and hypocrisy, and preparing his people for receiving only his disapprobation, would he not have warned us of our danger ? To suppose otherwise, is contrary to every idea we are taught to form of His benevolence and love. But our author represents this very use, as unfitting us for every christian duty, and treasuring up for ourselves the wrath of God, which is a doctrine utterly repugnant to the revealed will of God, and revolting to the mind of man. What are we then to think of the

self-righteous presumption, and blasphemous arrogance of the individual, or the society who can say to those who use distilled liquors, although attentive to religious duties, "Instead of mercy I hear his terrible remonstrance, 'Ye are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all day?' I see the lightning of his anger ready to smite such impious mockers." It is against those who presume to approach a throne of grace, or look devoutly to heaven, after using distilled liquors, that our author hears this remonstrance, and sees this lightning of the Lord directed. But, as our Lord's injunction to his disciples was general, without a single exception; and as he knew that distilled liquors would be in very general use in his church, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that they were sanctioned by the Saviour. We would ask, then, whether it is to those who use these liquors, or, to those who, in consummate arrogance, pronounce against them the heaviest penalties of offended justice, that the title of impious mockers is most applicable? There is nothing either of christian humility, or christian charity in such language as that made use of by our author, and when we find it to be directly contrary to the word of God, we cannot resist the conclusion that it does appear to savour much of blasphemy. But let us enquire for a little who they are of whom it is said, "These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day." This passage is found in Isaiah, Lxv, 50, and from the context it is evident that it applies to those who wish to appear holier than their neighbours, while they are hiding their impiety and sensuality under the long robe of hypocrisy. It is for you then to judge whether this character is most applicable to those who use distilled liquors, or to the absolutes. And, in order to form a correct judgment, it will only be necessary for you to ascertain which of them is most distinguished for arrogating to themselves the Pharasaical claim to superior sanctity.

In the last clause of the above quotation from the T. B. it is asked, "O how without sin, can His pure spirit be invoked to descend and mingle His holy influences with that spirit which worketh only iniquity and death?"

This question is not for us to answer, as it involves the deep things of God. But we know that God foretold by his prophet the use of distilled liquors (*Zechariah, ix, 17,*) as a great blessing to his church and people. We have also seen that Christ excepted no liquors in his commandment to his disciples. Paul also teaches us that there is nothing either in meats or in drinks unclean. Did Christ then enjoin upon his disciples, and did Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, sanction, by his apostolical authority, that which worketh only iniquity and death, and which pollutes the very air we breathe? Did Christ enjoin the use of that upon his people which makes it sin in them to invoke his pure spirit to descend and mingle with it, his holy influences? No; the very supposition is insulting to the Saviour, and the propagation of such a slander is nothing short of blasphemy.

T. B. *Scripture Arguments for Temperance*, page 9, it is written, "Suppose our Missionaries should go out with the bible in one hand and a bottle in the other, what impression would they make? Even nature herself would revolt at the alliance. And nothing but custom and fashion have reconciled any among us to similar inconsistencies at home. But, not only must our Missionaries be unspotted, they must also be able to testify that no real christians pollute themselves with this or any other unclean thing. With such testimony they might secure the conviction that our religion is indeed purifying and elevating, and that our God is the true God. For saith Jehovah, "Then shall the heathen know that I am the Lord, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes."

In answer to the first part of this quotation, it is worthy of remark, that it is purposely put in a shape to excite disgust, and not to impart instruction. True it is, that such an accompaniment might appear to some to be out of place, but would it be less indecorous for him to take in his hand, along with his bible, a leg of bacon to satisfy his appetite than a bottle of strong drink to quench his thirst? The one of these is sanctioned throughout the word of God for man's use, while the other, throughout the whole of the Old Testament at least, is represented as unclean. Besides, the heathen, so soon as they could read the word of God for themselves, would find that the ministers of religion, under the law, both used intoxicating liquors by the express permission of God, and that it was offered in sacrifice by His own special appointment; and also, that it was both used, and the use of it enjoined upon us by the Author and Finisher of our faith, and then they would be persuaded that there was at least no inconsistency in ministers using these things. But to put the case in its true light, let us suppose that missionaries among the heathen, were to refuse all alcoholic liquors, when set before them by the hospitality of those, among whom they were endeavouring to diffuse the light of the gospel of Christ. The question would very naturally follow, did Christ, whom you preach, forbid the use of these liquors? It is evident they could not reply that he did so, without being guilty of a direct falsehood, which the heathen would discover so soon as they could read the gospels. But if they should say that he did not forbid the use of these things, but that they were forbidden by the temperance society, of which they were members, the question would again naturally follow, is the authority of the temperance society superior to that of Jesus Christ, whom you have taught us to regard as the great God and our Saviour? To this the temperance missionaries would probably reply, that the temperance

society was an auxiliary to christianity, and tended to guard the disciples of Christ against the deadly sin of drunkenness.— Here another question would naturally be put by the heathen, namely, are you at liberty wilfully and directly to sin against your Lord, by disobeying his commandment, that you may guard us against the probability of becoming drunkards ? As no answer, satisfactory to the enquiring mind, could possibly be given to such a question, it would follow, as a natural consequence, that the heathen would reject the gospel scheme as a cunningly devised fable, and despise those by whom it was published. But besides the missionaries to the heathen being absolutes, which would unquestionably mar their usefulness, they must also be able to testify, that no real christians pollute themselves, (that is,) use alcoholic liquors or any other unclean thing. But supposing the heathen should attend to the missionaries reading over the word of God to them, they would find that when the Lord prohibited his people from eating many beasts, fowls and fishes, which he set apart as unclean by a special law, no drink of any kind, or any quality, was mentioned as unclean, or prohibited to His people. They would also find that no such thing as the use of any drink was represented as unclean in the New Testament. Besides, they would soon learn that the Saviour had expressly declared, “Not that which entereth into the man defileth the man.”— They would also learn that the Saviour says to missionaries in particular, “Into whatever house ye enter, eat and drink such things as they give.” Would these inconsistencies and contradictions to the word of God, even if supported by all who call themselves real christians, lead the heathen to believe that our God is the true God, or that our religion is purifying and elevating, seeing that christians themselves must act so contrary to its dictates, and walk so directly counter to its commandments, before they can attain what they themselves

consider a clean and pure state? Every man, therefore, who goes as a missionary to the heathen, clothed in this mixed garment, not of linen and woollen, but of those ever jarring materials, the commandments of God, and the commandments of men, ought to remember that he is insulting God, by teaching in his name, the commandments and doctrines of men, which he never sanctioned, and which he can never bless.

T. B. Four reasons against the use of Alcoholic Liquors, page 7, it is written, "Our fourth reason for the disuse of alcoholic liquors is, that any thing short of entire abstinence exposes to all the dread consequences just named. Here is the grand hope of our cause. **TOTAL ABSTINENCE** defies all danger and mocks at consequences. With it we are safe, without it, in peril."

The dread consequences which our author here alludes to, are those of becoming the victims of mad-houses—the inmates of hospitals and poor-houses—the want of inclination to prepare for death—and the loss of the soul. These are indeed dread consequences, and were they applicable to the use, as they are to the abuse of alcoholic liquors, we would say at once, that any sacrifice of worldly comfort should be made in order to escape from their polluting influence. In entire abstinence is the grand hope of the absolutes' cause.—That is to say, in an anti-christian scheme, rests the grand hope of this pretended christian society. Such language as this, is at least a strong presumptive evidence, of the total absence of true christian humility. How does total abstinence defy all dangers? It may set at defiance the sin of actual drunkenness, but this is only one danger. Does it set at defiance the just judgments of the Lord, for having set at nought

his commandments, and for attempting to overturn the very constitution of civilized society? Are they walking so perfectly, that they can demand as a matter of merited right, the felicity of heaven, and the favour of their God; and set at defiance the power, and the displeasure of the Judge of all the earth? Do they set at defiance the terrors of the law, because they have fulfilled the law? Does total abstinence defy all danger arising from other incitements to ungodly conduct? or is the sin of drunkenness the only sin of which the human family can now be guilty, and the only one by which they can incur the displeasure of the Lord? It is evident that a man may refrain entirely from all intoxicating liquors, and yet have no fear of God before his eyes, no faith in Christ, no concern for his immortal soul, and no hope of eternal life, and how in such a state can he defy all dangers? But total abstinence (our author tells us) mocks at consequences. This is not the language of a pious and chastened soul. How can the absolutes, without being guilty of awfully hardened presumption, mock at consequences, seeing their system is a system of errors, founded in falsehood, subversive of the scriptures, and offensive to the Lord. Can they mock at the consequences of their errors? Can they mock at the rewards of falsehoods, so zealously and so extensively circulated? Can they mock at the consequences of wilfully perverting the scriptures, and intentionally concealing the mind of the Lord, they may build up their anti-christian temple, with the elements of christianity which they have torn to pieces? Can they mock at the consequences of insulting the Lord, by setting aside his holy commandments, to make room for their devices? Is it then in such a society as this, that we can find our only safety; and are all without its pale, in jeopardy and standing in jeopardy every hour? No, it is not so. We must fear God and keep his commandments, for this is our

duty ; and let us not fear men, so as to follow their crooked ways, for this bringeth a snare. If our only safety is in total abstinence, then the gospel of Christ can no longer be regarded as the gospel of our salvation, for it contains no such precept ; and if safety is to be found no where else than in total abstinence, where then are the apostles, the martyrs, and the christians of other days, who had passed away before this child of new-light-heresy was heard to utter its infant cry ? It is only through the blood of Christ, and the renewing influences of the holy spirit, that we can become heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ Jesus ; and it is in this situation only that we can, with any shadow of propriety, mock at dangers, and defy consequences. The above quotation, therefore, is an open and public insult to the God of our salvation.

T. B. Barn's on the Traffic in Ardent Spirits, page 15, it is written, " We are prepared now to examine a few of the objections to this doctrine. The first is, that the traffic is not condemned in the Bible. To this the answer is very obvious. The article was then unknown. Nor was it known until six hundred years after the Bible was completed. This mode of extending and perpetuating depravity in the world was not suggested by the father of evil until it was too late to make a formal law against it in the Bible, or to fortify the argument of human depravity from this source. It is neither in the Bible, nor in any other code of laws, the custom to specify crimes which do not exist. How remarkable in a code of laws would have been such a declaration as the trafficker demands, " Thou shalt not deal in ardent spirits," hundreds of years before the article was known ? The world would have stood in amazement, and would have been perplexed and confounded by an unmeaning statute. But further, it is not the practice in the Bible, or in any other book of laws, to specify each shade and degree of wrong.

Had it been, there could have been no end of legislation, and no end to books of law. I ask the dealer in ardent spirits, where is there a formal prohibition of piracy, or bigamy, or kidnapping, or suicide, or duelling, or the sale of obscene books and paintings? And yet does any man doubt that these are immoral? Does he believe that the bible will countenance them? Will he engage in them because they are not specified formally, and with technical precision in the scriptures? The truth is, that the bible has laid down great principles of conduct, which on all these subjects can be easily applied, which are applied, and which under the guidance of equal honesty, may be as easily applied to the traffic of which I am speaking. Still further, the Bible has forbidden it in principle, and with all the precision which can be demanded. A man cannot pursue the business, as has been shown, without violating its great principles. He cannot do justly in it; he cannot show mercy by it; he cannot seek to alleviate human woes by it; he cannot do as he would wish to be done unto; he cannot pursue it to glorify God. The great principles of the Bible, the spirit of the Bible, and a thousand texts of the Bible, are pointed against it; and every step the trafficker takes, he infringes on the spirit and bearing of some declaration of God. And still further, it is his business to make out the propriety of the employment, not ours to make out the case against him. Here is the rule—for him to judge. By this he is to be tried; and unless he can find in the volume a rule that will justify him in a business for gain, that scatters inevitable woes and death; that accomplishes more destruction than all the chariots of war, and the desolations of gunpowder on the field of blood; that sends more human beings to the grave, than fire, and flood, and pestilence, and famine, altogether; that heaps on human society more burdens than all other causes combined; that sends armies on

armies—in a form more appalling and infinitely more loathsome than Napoleon's "food for cannon"—to the grave ; unless he can find some prophecy, or some principle, or some declaration, that will justify these, the Bible is against him, and he knows it. As well might he search for a principle to authorise him to plant a Bohon Upas on every man's farm, and in the heart of every city and hamlet."

You have now before you our authors whole answer to the first objection against the doctrine, that the traffic in ardent spirits is immoral. Namely, that the traffic is not condemned in the Bible. But it is a strange answer, and may pass for any thing but a refutation of the objection.—That ardent spirits were unknown until six hundred years after the Bible was compiled, is no reason whatever for the law against them not having been given, provided they are what the absolutes represent them to be. Did our author mean to say, that they were unknown to the lawgiver when the Bible was composed, and for six hundred years after it was completed? Such a declaration would be charging God directly with ignorance, and stripping Him of the attribute of omniscience. The Bible is not the production of men, but of God. Its laws and precepts are not adapted for any particular period only, but for every age and for every nation ; containing all that is necessary for life and for godliness. There is no vice of which men can be guilty, against which there is not a law in God's word. To suppose otherwise, would lead us to the conclusion, that, although God had formed man in his own image, and redeemed them when lost by the blood of his own Son, yet still he has left them without any sufficient code of laws to regulate their conduct in this world. But the fact is directly the reverse. Our author says, "this mode of

extending and perpetuating depravity in the world, was not suggested by the father of evil, until it was too late to make a formal law against it in the Bible." This would be a very strange declaration coming from any other but the absolutes, and is carrying out still farther the charge of ignorance on the part of God. But if the father of evil did not suggest ardent spirits until it was too late to make a formal law against them, what did the father of evil expect to derive from having suggested them to man?—For he knew, and you all know, if there is no law against this traffic, then no law could be broken by the traffic, and if no law is broken by the traffic, then it is as clear as noon-day that there could be no sin in the traffic, for sin is the breaking of the law. Although the father of evil did not suggest ardent spirits till six hundred years after the Bible was completed, we find, from Zechariah, ix, 17, that the Father of mercies did suggest them, nearly seven hundred years before the Bible was completed; but he suggested them not as an evil, but a blessing to man, and consequently we shall look in vain in the Bible for any law against the traffic in them. But is there not peculiar wickedness in attributing to the malice of the devil, as utterly pernicious, what God claims as his own rich and peculiar gift.

"It is not the practice in the Bible," says our author, "or in any other book of laws, to specify each shade or degree of wrong." This admission annihilates the whole of our author's argument. What is ardent spirits? Are brandy, and rum, and gin, and whiskey, ardent spirits? If so, then ardent spirits are strong drink; and is not strong drink mentioned frequently in the Bible? It does not matter whether the ardent spirits of the present day be a few shades stronger or weaker than the strong drink of the

Jews, still they are strong drink, possessing the same properties, and producing precisely the same effects, and consequently fall directly under the law applicable to strong drink. They are not therefore left, as our author supposes, without any direct law in the Bible respecting them. The change of the name, without changing their properties, does not exempt them from the operation of God's law.—You are aware that ardent spirits have their name from the circumstance of their burning when fire is applied to them. But supposing they were mixed with water until they would not ignite upon the application of fire, they would no longer be ardent spirits, and consequently dealing in them, according to our author's mode of reasoning, would cease to be an immorality, still they might be strong drink, and fall directly under the law of God regarding strong drink, or alcoholic liquors. But how absurd to suppose that they can be brought within the operation of the law of God, or removed beyond its reach, and that dealing in them is a moral, or an immoral business, according as their strength is increased or diminished by a very few percentages. Such a mode of reasoning is utterly unbecoming, wherever the holy law of God is in the question.

“I ask the dealer in ardent spirits,” continues our author, “where is there a formal prohibition of piracy, or bigamy, or kidnapping, or suicide, or duelling, or the sale of obscene books and paintings?” We are astonished at such a question as this. Is not piracy a name applicable to those who covet their neighbour's property, and who, in order to steal it, kill those to whom it belongs, or those who have the charge of it? But covetousness is expressly forbidden in the tenth commandment; murder is forbidden in the sixth commandment, and the eighth commandment prohibits

stealing ; thus all the vices which enter into the pirate's compound character are expressly forbidden in the law of the Lord. Bigamy, although often practised by the Jews, was directly contrary to the original law, by which marriage was instituted. It is said in Genesis, i, 27, " God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him ; male and female created he them." Not male and females. And in Genesis, ii, 24, " Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother ; and shall cleave unto his wife ; and they shall be one flesh." And the Saviour says in Matthew, xix, 5, " And they twain shall be one flesh." Thus expressly limiting the union to be between one man and one woman. And in 1 Corinthians, vii, 2, Paul says, " Let every man have his own wife, (not wives) and let every woman have her own husband." Now, since bigamy signifies having two wives, no law of prohibition can be clearer than the above.—Again, kidnapping is only another name for man-stealing, which is expressly forbidden in 1 Timothy, i, 10, where it is classed with the vilest sins that pollute humanity.—Again, as to suicide and duelling, they are directly forbidden in the sixth commandment.—The sale of obscene books and paintings is forbidden in the seventh commandment, also in Eph. v, 3, " But fornication and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not once be named among you as becometh saints. The effect of this commandment is shown in Acts, xix, 19, where we find that such books were publicly burned at Ephesus, to the value of fifty thousand pieces of silver. How then could our author endeavour to persuade us that these things are not forbidden in the word of God by any express precept?

Again, our author says, " The great principles of the Bible, the spirit of the Bible, and a thousand texts of

the Bible, are pointed against it, and every step the trafficker takes he infringes on the spirit and bearing of some declaration of God." We know not how this should be, seeing God commanded his people (as we have seen in a former lecture) to bestow the price of a certain tithe in the purchase of strong drink, or whatever else their soul lusted after ; and where were they to purchase this strong drink, unless from those who dealt in it ? But this very permission to purchase, and to use strong drink, contains His high sanction to deal in it. From this it is evident that the spirit of the Bible is not against the traffic in strong drink. But is it not strange negligence on the part of our author, who was so zealous to put down this traffic, that out of all his thousand texts pointed against it in the Bible, he should not have condescended, even upon one of them, to support his arguments, and to give even the appearance of truth to his assertion ? It was because he could not find one among all his thousand that would answer his purpose. Nor would he ever have found one, even if he had read the Bible a thousand times, for it is not there, and consequently he could not find it there. Again, our author says, " And still further, it is his business to make out the propriety of the employment, not ours to make out the case against him." From this we are led to believe, that our author's knowledge of the laws of civilized society was on a par with his knowledge of the divine law. If a man is at liberty to libel his neighbour publicly for immoral conduct, and yet to be freed from the burden of proving his libel, there is an end to the comfort and protection of civilized society. But it is evident that our author found the proof hopeless, otherwise he would have found no delicacy whatever in bringing it forward. It is, therefore, evident, although he has both recorded and

published his libel, since he has left it altogether without proof, that the libel can be regarded only as a malicious slander, and the libeller as a public defamer, which is not only sufficient legal evidence, but satisfactory moral evidence of the innocence of the party libelled. Without examining further into the assertions in the above quotation, there appears no reason why we should not pronounce it a satire on the Bible, and therefore a direct insult to the author of that holy book.

T. B. Barns on the Traffic in Ardent Spirits, page 20, it is written ; "Every church of Christ the world over should be in very deed an organization of pure temperance, under the headship and patronage of Jesus Christ the friend and model of purity."

In reply to this quotation, we have to remark, that taking the sentiment without regard to its connection, it is unobjectionable, and might be subscribed by every christian. But when we consider what the absolutes mean by pure temperance, and that it is said in the preceding page of this very book, "I call on all whom I now address to exert their influence in this cause, to abandon all connection with the traffic, and to become the firm, and warm, and thorough going advocates of the temperance reform," we certainly can neither subscribe it ourselves, nor recommend the subscription of it to others. It is nothing less than calling upon all christians, to become firm, warm, and thorough going advocates of the temperance scheme, in all its wildness, and in all its impiety. Let us suppose the scheme carried into full operation as here described, and that every member of the church of Christ on earth had signed the pledge of total abstinence, what would be the

consequence? Would there any longer be a pure church on earth? No, it is as impossible to be thorough going members of the temperance reform, and at the same time consistent members of the church of Christ, as it is to serve God and mammon at the same time. How can these men even dare to mention the name of Jesus Christ, as the head and patron of a society for absolute abstinence. Did he observe the rule which they have set down for themselves? Did he refuse to partake of the drink which his entertainers set before him at the festive board? Not one single instance of this is found on record. Besides we have the best grounds to think that he never did, otherwise he would not have commanded his disciples, to eat and drink, what was set before them, making no exception of any meat or of any drink. But what are we to think of what is said here of Jesus Christ as the friend and model of purity? We know he was so, that he did no sin neither was there any guile found in him. But supposing any mere man in this day was to act the same part which he did, in so far as regards partaking of what was set before him in the shape of drink, would not the absolutes denounce him as a drunkard. Christ is not their patron, for he used what drink was set before him, but they refuse all intoxicating liquors. Their Society is not therefore founded on his model. Christ said to his disciples into whatsoever house ye enter, eat and drink such things as they give, but the absolutes say to their disciples regarding all intoxicating liquors, touch not, taste not, handle not; wherever and however the temptation is presented, avoid it, turn from it and pass away. Their Society is not therefore founded on his commandment, and the purity of his example is set aside as too low a standard for their imitation. How then without the grossest insult can they pre-

sume to say that their society is under his patronage, that he is the head thereof, and that it is founded upon the model of his example.

It would be presuming too far upon your patience to examine any further into this doctrine. If what has already been said, does not convince you that the T. B. contains assertions in support of the absolutes' cause, which are insulting to the Holy One of Israel, nothing which we can now say, is likely to do so. We also consider it unnecessary at present to expose any more of the pernicious doctrines of the absolutes, persuaded, if what has already been exposed, does not convince you, that their system, is a system of pernicious errors, nothing we can now say, is likely to awaken you from your dream of self-righteous security.

LECTURE VII.

POINTING OUT A SOCIETY FOUNDED ON HOLY PRINCIPLES, AND REQUIRING PURE AND SCRIPTURAL TEMPERANCE IN ALL ITS MEMBERS.

In our first Lecture we stated, that we have ever been advocates for temperance in all things, in the sense in which that phrase is applied in Scripture. We also intimated in our first lecture that if we should succeed in convincing you of the absurdity, and pernicious tendency of of the temperance society, as it is at present constituted, we would devote one lecture to point out what we con-

ceive to be a rational and effectual plan to stem throughout the world the tide of intemperance. It is therefore the avowed object of the present lecture, to point out to you a society, founded on holy principles, and requiring pure and scriptural temperance ; and to urge upon you all, as you value your present peace and future happiness, to become members of it. Our former lectures being purposely directed against the errors of the absolutes, and to expose some of their absurdities and heresies, we merely considered in them the use, not the abuse of alcoholic liquors. But, trusting that the pernicious doctrines of the absolutes have now been laid open, in such a manner as to satisfy the mind of every unprejudiced individual, that the temperance society, as it is at present constituted, is neither founded on the word of God, nor in accordance with the word of God, and that in very many particulars it is directly contrary to that holy word, we shall now proceed to the object more immediately before us.

But, previous to pointing out any cure for the abuse of alcoholic liquors, it will be necessary to show that the abuse is an immorality, with some of its consequences, both to the individual and to society. But we trust it would be utterly unnecessary to enter into any lengthened discussion in your presence, to prove that the abuse of alcoholic liquors, or drunkenness, is an immorality and a violation of the law of God. We trust, also, that you all believe the Bible, so far, at least, as to acknowledge its authority, and to submit implicitly to its verdict regarding what is moral, and what is immoral. To such only our argument is directed. But if you believe the Bible even thus far, you must also believe that the abuse of alcoholic liquors, or drunkenness, is an immorality not of an ordinary shade, but

of a very aggravated character, calling down upon the drunkard not only the temporal displeasure, but what is far greater, the eternal wrath of an offended God. For it is evident, from many passages of scripture, that this sin brings down upon the drunkard the wrath of God both for time, and for eternity—both on the body, and the soul.—We find in the book of Deut. *xxi*, 20, 21, that under the law, the drunkard and the glutton were to be stoned to death publicly ; and under the gospel, the drunkard is expressly said to be debarred from heaven. This is evident from *1 Cor.*, *vi*, 9, 10, where it is said, “ Be not deceived ; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor *drunkards*, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.” And again in *Gal.*, *v*, 19, 20, 21, it is said, “ Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, *drunkenness*, revellings, and such like, of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things, shall not inherit the kingdom of God.”—These, without adducing the many similar declarations which are contained in the word of God, afford satisfactory evidence, that the abuse of alcoholic liquors, or drunkenness, is an immorality, and classed with the vilest crimes which disgrace humanity.

But where the line of demarkation, between the use and the abuse of alcoholic liquors, should be placed, may still be considered as a point in dispute, which should be settled before any thing definite can be said on this subject. It is clear that this line cannot be fixed, by prescribing any

given quantity of these liquors as being within the bounds of temperance, and that every thing beyond this is abuse and drunkenness. This is evident from the circumstance, that the quantity, which would be gross abuse in one man, might in another not exceed the bounds of perfect sobriety. Neither can we determine the limits between the use and the abuse, by the personal evidence of those who have abused these liquors, for the drunkard himself is the last man in every company to become sensible of his own degraded situation. And not unfrequently, the habitual drunkard passes through life, pleasing himself with the idea, that the appellation of drunkard applies not to him, although he is found returning to his vomit as often as an opportunity offers, and although, as often as he returns to his vomit, he is also found literally wallowing in the mire.

But our opinion of scripture temperance is, that whenever alcoholic liquors, of any kind, are taken, so as to derange the natural operations either of the bodily faculties, or the mental powers, we have passed the limits of temperance, and are no longer using the world so as not to abuse it. It is evident, therefore, that whenever alcoholic liquors of any kind are taken, so as to impair the faculties either of the body or the mind, that we are abusing these things, and if we are in the habit of repeating this abuse, whenever opportunity offers, it is equally evident that we are drunkards. When God gave these drinks to cheer and to make glad the heart of man, he also fenced them round with the terrors of his terrible judgments, to guard us against the abuse of them. But wisdom and personal interest, both require that we should keep far within the line, which marks the utmost verge of the territory disputed by virtue and vice. For even occasional aberrations from virtue's path may fix a thorn in our hearts, which will far

more than counterbalance a long life of sensual pleasures. — We have a lasting admonition on this subject in the case of Noah, who was saved from the wreck of the antediluvian world. For in Gen. ix, we learn, that he having become an husbandman, planted a vineyard, and drank of the wine, and was drunken, and when he awoke from his wine, and knew that his second son had looked upon him without compassion, while in this state, he was led to pass a lasting curse upon the offspring of this child. How solemn then the warning in this place to all parents, not to be drunken, even once, in the presence of their family, lest thereby they should entail a curse upon their offspring by their example, which may not be blotted out for many generations. We have another warning to the same effect, in the case of Lot, Gen. xix, who was snatched by the angels as a brand from the burning, when the Lord overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah by a storm of fire and brimstone, sent down from heaven upon them, as a national judgment for their gross sensuality. Yet this same Lot, after being delivered by the immediate interposition of the Lord, from the awful destruction of these devoted cities, was led through two excesses in alcoholic liquors, to the commission of crimes which blot his character, and which time can never wipe from the page of his biography. Will any man then say, that there is no danger in approaching to, or in dwelling near the confines of vice. Again, in Gen. xxix, we find that Jacob had been exceeding in the use of liquors, at the marriage feast, which Laban prepared for him, and that the morning brought him bitter sorrow ; and convinced him, by the deception which had been practised upon him, that they are not wise who are overcome by strong drink. Yes, his fondest hopes were blasted, and himself doomed to seven years' servitude, as the wages of his folly. Let then the truth, that even being occasionally drunken, by those who are the Lord's own chosen

people, exposes them to his just displeasure, and brings upon themselves trials, sorrows, and disappointments, which are but ill compensated by any temporary excitement of the animal spirits, which may be experienced in the whole process of becoming drunken. This should also operate as a powerful caution against acting upon the principle, however true, that a man may be drunken and yet not be a drunkard. For it is evident, although he may afterwards abhor himself on account of this deed, that he has been guilty of a gross immorality, by carelessly throwing down his armour of reason and judgment, bestowed upon him by his Lord, the captain of his salvation, and notwithstanding of every remonstrance in the word of God, thrown himself for a time into the ranks of the enemy of his soul. Although God is merciful, and full of compassion to the human race, although he afflicteth not willingly, nor grieveth the children of men, yet, whom he loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. But let us remember that these chastisements are brought upon ourselves by such violations of his holy laws, and they are inflicted, not for his pleasure, but for our profit. Let us not, then, approach heedlessly or presumptuously near to the vortex of drunkenness, least we be swallowed up in that vortex, and left to reap the drunkard's reward.

Having thus guarded against the occasional abuse of alcoholic liquors, we shall now point out some of the consequences of the habitual abuse of them, in so far as regards the drunkard himself. We would remark of him, that he appears to be of all men the most miserable. This sensual indulgence is shown by his conduct, to be paramount in his estimation to every other consideration. He knows that he is thereby wasting his body, and destroying his soul. He knows that he is thereby fostering his appetite, upon the spoils of his

judgment. He knows that he is thereby pampering the animal passions, while he is debasing all the faculties that are distinctive of man. He knows that he is thereby reducing all that is noble within him, into abject slavery to those passions which are common to man, with the most grovelling of the brute creation. Nor is the drunkard ignorant, that his degrading conduct renders him a nuisance in every society, of which the members are not equally degraded in this respect as himself. He knows well that no man of character, and rectitude of conduct, can possibly associate freely with him, without contracting a blot in the estimation of all right thinking men. He soon becomes conscious, that the society of those with whom he used to associate, and with whom he had enjoyed much rational pleasure, is no longer pleasing to him, even if he were permitted to enjoy it. His own domestic circle, looses its attractions. The partner of his life, is no longer pleasing. The children whom he once loved, are no longer amiable. The dwelling which he once blessed by his presence, is now made to feel deeply the curse of his conduct. The table which was once furnished abundantly by the fruits of his industry, is now remarkable, only, for the want of all things. The family which were once clothed, and comfortable, and happy, and an ornament to the neighbourhood, while he was in his right mind, and sober senses, are now covered with rags, chilled with cold, living on bitter crumbs, degraded in the neighbourhood in which they dwell, and pitied by all, but the besotted individual who ought to have loved them as himself, and cherished them as his own body. If there is any truth in the apostolic declaration, that, "He who provideth not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, has denied the faith, and is become worse than an infidel," it must apply without mitigation to the drunkard. But if the infidel has no title to expect the rewards of faith, and the joys of heaven, how

can the drunkard, who neglects to provide for his own family, entertain the hope, seeing that he is expressly declared in the word of God, to be worse than an infidel? No, there is no hope for the drunkard, while he remains such. There is only to crown his earthly misery, the fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation, to consume him from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. The truth, and the justice of God are both pledged, that, if he live and die a drunkard, he shall be consigned to the lake of fire, with the devil and the false prophet, where joy can never enter, where hope can never come, where weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth shall never cease, and where the worm of a guilty conscience shall gnaw, and riot for ever upon his polluted soul. How awful, how inconceivable, how unutterable the folly of that man, who would purchase a few years' enjoyment of the grossest, and most debasing of sensual gratifications, at such an infinite price!

But what are the bewitching pleasures which induce men to become drunken, and to remain drunkards? Is it because the fumes of the intoxicating bowl are more agreeable to them, than the sweets of domestic comfort?—Is it because the profane jest, the boisterous debate, and the demoralizing song are more rational sources of enjoyment in his estimation, than the innocent frolics, the endearing confidence, and the affectionate embrace of his own children? Is it because the midnight revelry, the fiendish yell, the distorted countenance, and the war of evil passions raging without control, in which all command and none obey, are more pleasing, more rational, and more profitable, in his estimation, than the composed devotional countenance, and the evening incense of prayer and praises, ascending from the domestic altar, as a sweet memorial before the throne of grace?—

O no! it is because he has become the bondman of him who is the enemy of all righteousness. It is because the yoke of satan is upon his neck, and his spirit has possessed his heart. It is because he is no longer his own master, but is a slave, in worse than Egyptian bondage, whose servitude terminates not with the grave, but extends through all eternity. If the heart of the drunkard were not changed into the heart of a demon, how could he resist being melted down to penitential sorrow, by the entreaties of his friends, and by the prayers, the tears, and the affectionate remonstrances of his much-injured partner in life? If there is any remaining sensibility in the drunkard's heart, what poignant feelings must torment his mind, when he sees his family careworn, disconsolate, and ready to perish with hunger, and cold, through the madness of his own folly. When his former acquaintance and friends, turn their backs, and avoid his company as polluted, and a disgrace to humanity, has he no heart to feel this, has he no desire to return again to the path of duty and of virtue? No man in his sound senses would agree to pay the price for all the riches of this world, which the poor deluded drunkard is doomed to pay for his debasing, demoralizing and unsatisfying gratification.

But if these are only a few of the consequences of drunkenness, to the individual who is under its influence, what, it may be asked, are its effects upon society? There is perhaps no better point from which to commence our remarks in answer to this question, than the centre of the drunkard's own family. In this position, provided they are depending for their daily support, upon the industry of their drunken head, there will be ocular demonstration of the effects of this destructive vice. The tear-worn countenance, and the tattered garments of a disappointed, and neglected partner; the anxious and

emaciated appearance of his maltreated, and half-starved children, tell in a language which all can read, that the drunkenness of the head of a family, bereaves them both of peace and comfort. But the answer to a few simple questions, will elicit a fact, far more alarming than even the privation of worldly comforts. You will soon discover, that there are no traces of christian example, no sound of christian precepts, no domestic altar, no fear of the Lord, and no rays of christian hope found in that family. Supposing, then, that drunkenness were generally to prevail, and the same consequences were to follow, as they must necessarily do, what would be the state of human society? Morality and religion would soon be banished from the earth, activity and industry would disappear, confidence in each other would be unknown among men, famine and disease, and pestilence, and ungovernable passions, would lay desolate populous cities, convert the fruitful fields into a wilderness, and disperse the remaining fragments of the human family into wandering tribes, sunk into awful ignorance, subsisting on the beasts of the forest, and the natural productions of the wilderness, as their only support. This is the outline of the consequences of universal drunkenness, and the manner in which it would naturally cure itself. Is the drunkard innocent then in the estimation of an enlightened public, who obstinately pursues a plan, and sets an example, which, if generally followed, would banish religion from the earth, consume the human family, shut the gates of heaven, lay open the doors of destruction, and bring a deluge of vice, and immorality over the face of the whole earth? If he is innocent whose conduct tends to produce such awful consequences, who then can be guilty in the eye of heaven's holy law?

How often has sudden destruction fallen upon the human family, when engaged in the madness of dissipation? We find

in Judges, xvi, that the Philistines were cut off in a moment, in the midst of their dissipation, when they called for Samson to make sport in their presence. We find in 1 Kings, xvi, 9, that Elah the king of Israel was also slain by his servant, while drinking himself drunk in the house of Azza. Again, we find in 1 Kings, xx, that the army of Benhadad king of Assyria, was overthrown by a handful of the youths of Israel, when he, and the thirty-two kings in league with him, were drinking themselves drunk in their tents at noon day. The great Babylon, which had long held the earth in subjection, was also overthrown in a moment, when her king, her princes, and her people were drunken and asleep, and was made a perpetual desolation. The great Ninaveh likewise, as we find in Nahum, i, 10, was overthrown, and consumed as stubble full dry, while her inhabitants were folded together as thorns, and while they were drunken as drunkards. It is thus evident from the scriptures of truth, that the Lord has stamped the sin of drunkenness with the seal of his awful disapprobation, whether it be found in an individual, in a family, or in a nation.

There is another reason why drunkenness should be avoided, both by individuals, by families, and by nations, and that is, drunkenness inflames the animal passions, throws down the barriers of reason, and of judgment, and exposes the whole citadel of the heart unguarded, as the sport, and the prey of every unhallowed passion. But, by indulging in these passions, which is a necessary consequence of drunkenness, they debase themselves, beneath the dignity of the brute creation, and bring upon themselves the merited displeasure of the God of heaven, whom they have insulted, by trampling the very badge distinctive of man, beneath their feet, in the mire of dissipation. Whether drunkenness, then, is viewed as a personal, a family, or a national vice, it is the centre of attraction

for all that is vile, degraded, and polluting ; while, by a law of nature directly opposite, it repels from it all that is pure, lovely and of good report. For it is as impossible for morality and religion to dwell with dissipation and drunkenness, as it is for light to dwell with darkness, vice with virtue, and happiness with misery.

This fact being fully established, both by the authority of the word of God, and the consent of civilized society, we now proceed to the great object of the present lecture, viz : to direct your attention to a temperance society, founded on pure, and scriptural, and holy principles, and which we conceive to be perfectly efficient, to stem throughout the world the tide of intemperance, and of which every individual would find it to be for his interest, both for time and for eternity, to become a member. But we are aware you will be astonished by such an announcement from us, after having pulled to pieces the principles of a society for promoting temperance, which many thousands conceive to be better calculated to secure this end, so much to be desired, than any other that has ever yet been promulgated to man. We are also aware that you may entertain some suspicions, after hearing the above announcement, that our object in exposing the absurdities and errors of what is called the temperance society, is ambitious, not pure ; for gaining a name to ourselves, and not for advancing the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom on earth, and in the hearts of men. Nor are we ignorant that we are exposing ourselves to the sneer of contempt, and the malicious insinuations of many, for having denominated a society as heretical which was formed with some care, and propagated with much activity, and which has received the countenance and support of many of the learned and benevolent ; and yet presume to point out one, founded on such principles, and possessing such importance

as that to which we have now alluded. Nor are we ignorant that he who disturbs the hornet's nest, exposes himself to their sting, for the wasp defends his poison with as much determination, as the bee does her honey. But let it be borne in mind, that the society to which we are about to direct your attention, is not new, that it is not the fruit of our own wisdom, and that it is founded on principles which were known and acknowledged before our day, and you will at least grant that we claim no merit of invention. The society to which we purpose to direct your attention, had its origin in heaven, was planned by infinite wisdom before the foundation of the world, was gradually promulgated by the holy prophets, until it was perfected by the son of God, and published to the world by his disciples. It is such a society to which we have alluded above.

The church of Christ is a temperance society, founded on pure and holy principles, and it is of this society that we would urgently entreat you all to become members, and to regulate your lives by its rules, precepts and commandments. If any society on earth has a claim upon you on account of its antiquity, it is christianity; for—its plan was laid in eternity. If any society has a claim upon you on account of its high descent, it is christianity; for it came down from God out of heaven.— If any society has a claim upon you on account of the wisdom of its author, it is christianity; for it was devised by the infinite wisdom of God. If any society has a claim upon you on account of the dignity and respectability of the individual who stands at its head, as its patron, and upon whom rests the responsibility of the whole, it is christianity; of which the living head is the Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, whom all the hosts of heaven do worship, and all the saints adore.—

If any society has a claim upon you, on account of the great and happy change which it is calculated to produce, it is christianity ; for it tends directly to subdue every evil passion, and degrading propensity, and to fit us for enjoying the company of angels, and blessed spirits, in the kingdom of God for ever and ever. And if any society is founded on pure and holy principles, and requiring of its members, pure and holy lives, it is christianity ; for its principles were fixed, and its requirements determined, when nothing but purity was found in the whole universe of God, and before satan himself had ceased to be an angel of light.

This fact being established upon the firm foundation of the prescience and immutability of God, it follows as a necessary consequence, that the christian scheme contains pure, and holy, and sufficient directions, for the regulation of our conduct in every situation of life, and in every thing that pertains to life and to godliness. But no man, who has ever read the scriptures with any degree of attention, can doubt for one moment, that the law regarding the use and the abuse of alcoholic liquors is there laid down with clearness and precision. It remains then for every individual to decide for himself, whether he ought to regulate his conduct in this particular case, by the pure and immutable law of his God, or by the commandments and ever varying traditions of men. But when making this decision, it ought ever to be born in mind, that it is by the law of God, and not by the commandments of men, that we are to be judged, when this mortal shall have put on immortality. We have already shown, by many infallible proofs adduced in our former lectures, that the law of God regulating the christian scheme, does sanction the use of alcoholic liquors, without any exception as to the kinds or strengths of those liquors. It now only remains to show, that christianity does naturally and necessarily prohibit the abuse of those liquors.

In order to establish this truth, it will only be necessary to adduce a few pertinent passages of scripture, and point out their bearing upon this subject. In Psalms, **lxi**, 10, 11, 12, the Psalmist (who is called the man after God's own heart,) says, "When I wept and chastened my soul with fasting, that was to my reproach. I made sackcloth also my garment, and I became a proverb to them. They that sit in the gate speak against me, and I was the song of the drunkards." From this it is evident, that religious duties and pious men, who serve God in sincerity, and honour him with their substance, are made the song, the by-word, and the scoff of the drunkards. But since drunkards do mock at religious men, for the faithful discharge of their religious duties, it follows that drunkards are not religious men, but scoffers and profane,—not christians, but despisers both of christianity and of its divine author. Again, in Proverbs, **xx**, 1, it is said by Solomon, who had every opportunity of witnessing the truth which he states, "Wine is a mocker, and strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise."—This passage shows clearly the nature and tendency of alcoholic liquors. They are mockers; for the strongest and wisest of men indulging in them to excess, become weak as children, and foolish too as children. Strong drink is also raging when taken to excess, for the animal passions are thereby inflamed, and the man who is under its influence, is left the sport and the prey of every unhallowed disposition. This is the testimony of scripture, and it is confirmed by the experience of civilized society. But Solomon concludes his remarks by saying, "Whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise. Christians are commanded to be wise as serpents, and harmless as doves, and this commandment will be observed by all who deserve that honourable name. But if they allow themselves to be deceived by strong drink, they are not acting according to this com-

mandment, they are not maintaining the christian character, and they are proving to demonstration, that they possess little of that wisdom which maketh wise unto salvation. Again, in Proverbs, xxiii, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, it is said expressly, "be not among wine bibbers, among riotous eaters of flesh, for the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty; and drunkenness shall clothe a man with rags. Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babblings? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine, they that go to seek mixed wine. Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright; at the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder. Thine eyes shall behold strange women, and thine heart shall utter perverse things." No paternal warning can be more distinct than this, "be not among wine bibbers." This is the command which our Lord has given to all his servants, and if they will not hear and respect his authority, who is now their benefactor, and who hereafter is to be their judge, can we expect that they will obey any commandment of men on the same subject? The reason of the command is also stated distinctly, namely, that the drunkard shall come to poverty. Men in their sound senses are generally distinguished by active and persevering exertions to avoid poverty, but the drunkard in the plenitude of his wisdom, runs on with a fiend-like speed to plunge himself and his family into the very centre of that land of drought and of famine, from which all other men are escaping, as if for their lives. But we are again told in the same passage, that woe, and sorrow, and contentions, and babblings, and wounds without cause, and redness of eyes, are the portion of those who sit long at the wine, and who go to seek mixed wine. Every sober man who can muster sufficient courage to look on so deformed a monster as a

drunken human being, must observe, that the same consequences still flow from this vice, as Solomon observed nearly three thousand years ago. These consequences are not the proofs of the christian principle, but melancholy evidence of the want of that heavenly principle. Solomon commands not to look upon the wine when it is red in the cup, &c. He was well aware of the danger those were in, who were given to excess, when such a temptation was placed within their reach, and warns them of their danger, by setting before them the painful consequences which he had already enumerated under the similitude of the bite of a serpent, and the sting of an adder. But lest these consequences should not be sufficient to deter the drunkard from indulging to excess, he adds other two consequences of drunkenness ; namely, that the drunkard's eyes shall behold strange women, and his heart shall utter perverse things. But Solomon says of the strange woman, " that her house is the way to hell, and her guests are in the depths of hell." The perverse things here alluded to, are evidently the same as the Saviour enumerates as coming out of the heart, and defiling the man, viz : evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornication, thefts, false witness, blasphemies. But these things are all forbidden in the christian religion, as well as every thing which leads directly to them, consequently drunkenness which is an excitement to these vices, is forbidden. In Isaiah, v, 11, 12, 14, we find the following terrible declaration, " Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink, that continue until night, till wine inflame them ! And the harp, and the viol, and the tabret and pipe, and wine are in their feasts, but they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of his hands. Therefore hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure ; and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth shall descend into it." No society of men could

describe more correctly, or denounce more awfully, the degrading conduct of the drunkard, than what the prophet has done in this passage. His morning debauch, the mid-day dissipation ; the noisy mirth, revelling and drunkenness of the night ; and with all a heart utterly callous to the works and operations of the Lord. But this is not all. Hell is represented as having put herself into readiness for their reception, by enlarging her caverns, and opening wide her mouth for their admission, that their glory, pomp, and rejoicing, may descend into her ; where, if we understand the scriptures, all will be changed into weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, the worm of conscience unscared, the lake of fire unquenched, and the wrath of God resting upon them without hope, either of end, or mitigation. With this certain prospect ever staring the drunkard in the face, will he still stagger onward to the mouth of the crater of eternal destruction, or will not his hand rather be paralysed, and his heart terror-smitten, until he turn and flee for the life of his soul to the mercy of God in Christ Jesus.—These are arguments against drunkenness, and motives to sobriety, which are only to be found in the word of the Lord, and in the church of the living God. We must acknowledge then that christianity is in itself a temperance society, founded on principles which infinite wisdom alone could devise, and guarded by penalties, which infinite justice, and infinite power alone can wield.

There is one case, in which a man who is not himself a drunkard may destroy his own comfort, and bring down upon himself the displeasure of heaven by the use which he makes of alcoholic liquors. This is clearly stated by the prophet Habakkuk, who says in the 11, 15, "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that putteth thy bottle to him and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look upon their nakedness."

One or two examples taken from the word of God will be sufficient to illustrate this truth. In 2 Samuel, xi, 13, we find that David the king of Israel put his bottle to Uriah's mouth, and made him drunk, not through friendship, nor hospitality, but for the express purpose, that he might thereby hide his own shame, and look upon the nakedness of his servant with impunity. But God looked upon his transgression with displeasure ; and although upon repentance, the guilt of his sin was blotted out, yet for his violation of the holy law of his God, he was visited with severe family disgrace, bereavements, and insubordination. Another instance of this we find in 2 Samuel, xiii, where Absalom put the cup to his brother Ammon's mouth, and made him drink, for the very purpose that he might then with impunity to himself, take away the life of his brother. But for this wicked deed, he was left to run the full career of vice, to lift his hand against the Lord's anointed, and to perish as a traitor against his own father. These are satisfactory proofs, that the holy law of God, which enjoins temperance upon all his people, cannot be violated with impunity.

But, if intemperance was forbidden, and severely punished under the law, which was only a temporary and imperfect dispensation, how much more must it be forbidden, and punished under the gospel, which is both a perfect, and a permanent dispensation. Accordingly, we find in Matthew, xxiv, 48, 49, 50, 51, the Saviour saying, to such as are appointed to feed the flock of his people, " If that evil servant shall say in his heart, my Lord delayeth his coming ; and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken ; the Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites ; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Here, then, is an express prohibition under the severest penalties, not confined to the body, but reaching to the soul; not limited to time, but extending through eternity, given by our Lord himself, against his servants associating with drunkards, so as to learn their ways, and imitate their practices. No law can be more positive, and no penalty can be more severe, than what is here set forth by the Holy One of Israel; and no execution can be more certain, than what will follow upon those who continue to neglect this heavenly precept. Again, in Luke, xxi, 34, 35, and 36, the Saviour says to his disciples, in every age of the world, "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares; for as a snare shall it come upon all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man." The Saviour's former injunction, applied more directly to the ministers of religion, but this is general, applying to the whole church, and calling upon every member of his mystical body, to guard against surfeiting and drunkenness. It is worthy of remark, that this passage prohibits not only habitual drunkenness, but even a single act of drunkenness. For, it is not said, lest your hearts *being frequently* overcharged, but expressly, lest at any time, that is, on any single occasion, your hearts be overcharged with drunkenness. No prohibition can be more distinct than that which is here given by the Saviour, against even a single act of drunkenness, on the part of his people. Again, in Luke, xii, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, we find the Saviour cautioning the rich men of this world, against trusting in their worldly riches, and engaging in dissipation and drunkenness, and teaching them the utter insignificance of these things on that night when they shall be called

to give in their account of a stewardship which they have abused. We have now seen, that the great Head of the church has prohibited drunkenness, not only in his ministering servants and worshipping people, but even in the careless men of this world. Who then will presume to deny, that christianity embraces in its very constitution, those laws of temperance which its divine founder knew to be best adapted for promoting his own glory, and the best interests of his people ?

Such being the injunctions of the great Head of the church, it is natural to expect that the same doctrine of temperance would be taught by the apostles, who were under the immediate influence of his spirit. Accordingly, we find in Romans, *xiii*, 13, the command, “ Let us walk honestly, as in the day, not in rioting and drunkenness.” This is the apostolic injunction to all the members of the church of Christ ; for although the epistle was directed to the christians at Rome, yet its maxims are applicable to the whole church, prohibiting drunkenness in all who are called christians. This is fully confirmed by the positive command of the same apostle, in 1 Cor. *v*. 11, where he says, “ But now have I written unto you not to keep company—if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner—with such an one,—no not to eat.” It is scarcely possible that language can convey any injunction, in plainer or more definite terms than the above.

If any man then, who is called a christian, be a drunkard, we are hereby expressly commanded, without any regard to his rank or circumstances, to hold no christian intercourse with him ; no, not even to eat in his company. But, is not this the very highest censure which any society is in the habit

of stamping upon those who have professed themselves to be its members, and who wilfully and habitually violate the acknowledged rules of the society? Christians are left no liberty of choice, they must either cease to associate with the drunkard, who is called a brother, or they must stand condemned for a wilful and habitual violation of the law of God. Again, 1 Cor. vi, 9, 10, the apostle says, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived, neither thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, shall inherit the kingdom of God." It is evident, then, that christianity makes not only a temporal, but also an eternal separation between the members of the church of Christ, and the sensual votaries of drunkenness and dissipation. Again, in Gal. v, 19, 20, 21, the apostle cautions the christians in Galatia against drunkenness as one of the works of the flesh, which excludes those who are under its influence from the kingdom of God. In Eph. v, 18, the church at Ephesus is expressly enjoined, "Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess." But if we obey not the command of the apostle, it is evident that we are dishonouring him, and the Saviour said to his apostles, "He that dishonoureth you, dishonoureth me, and he that dishonoureth me, dishonoureth him that sent me." From this it is clear, even to demonstration, that the drunkard is dishonouring the great God of heaven, who has power not only to kill the body, but also to destroy both soul and body in hell. In 1 Timothy, iii, 2, 3, 8, 11, the apostle says, "A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine. Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things." Again, in Titus, i, 7, 8, and ii, 1, 2, 3, 4, we find a repetition of nearly the same injunctions which were

given to Timothy, from which it is evident, that all who were called to bear rule in the church, and all immediately connected with them, were not only forbidden to be drunkards, but enjoined to be sober, and exemplary in all their conduct, and deportment, and conversation, and thus to adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things ; and to give no just cause to the enemies of religion to blaspheme. In 1 Peter, v, 8, all christians are commanded, “Be sober, be vigilant ; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour.” But it is evident, that they who are not sober cannot be vigilant, and that drunkards, by disregarding the commandment of the Lord, are exposing themselves unarmed to the attacks of that roaring lion, who destroys not only the bodies but also the souls of men.

Upon the strength of the quotations which have now been made from the word of God, without regard to many others which might still be adduced, no one can hesitate to acknowledge, that the abuse of alcoholic liquors, or drunkenness, is prohibited in the scriptures under the severest penalties.—Neither can any one doubt, from the tenor of these quotations, that the drunkard, so long as he remains such, is exposing himself to the wrath of the Lord. Neither can it be doubted, from the bearing of these quotations, that the drunkard has no title whatever, either to the name or the hopes of a christian. Who then will dare to deny that christianity is in its very constitution a temperance society, founded on pure and holy principles ? Who will dare to affirm, that there is on the face of the whole earth, such a monster as a drunkard and a christian in the same person ? Such a thing is utterly impossible, for the drunkard, while he continues his debasing practice, excludes himself from the hopes of the christian, and the word of God has expressly commanded his exclusion from the society of christians.

There can be no doubt whatever, that intemperance, or drunkenness, is one of the prominent vices on this great continent. But the prevalence of drunkenness, in any country, or in any society, is direct evidence, even to demonstration, of the want of christian principles in that country or community. For the more generally the christian spirit is diffused, the more generally will drunkenness, with all its train of concomitant vices, be held in abhorrence and banished from society. But the more generally infidelity, either real or practical, is propagated, the more generally will drunkenness, dissipation, and every degrading vice, spread among the ranks of civilized society. What then is the cause of drunkenness? It is evidently not the abundance of intoxicating liquors, as has falsely been supposed, for every one at all acquainted with the science of political economy, knows that it is the demand which creates the supply, and not the supply which produces the demand. The manufacturer of alcoholic liquors would soon cease to prosecute his business, unless retailers continued their orders, and the retailers would soon discontinue their purchases, unless their customers, the consumers of these liquors, continue their demands upon him. It is evident, therefore, that the want of christian principle is the primary cause of creating the excessive demand for intoxicating liquors, and consequently of producing the supply. It is equally evident, that the increase of christian principle would lessen the demand for these liquors, and thereby diminish the supply. This is not a vain chimera, nor is it a deduction from doubtful premises, but a great and important truth, supported by the clearest testimony of scripture. For in 1 Cor. vi, 11, the apostle having just enumerated the sins which exclude from the kingdom of God, of which drunkenness is mentioned as one, says, "And such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the

Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God." And in 1 Peter, iv, 3, 4, "For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings and abominable idolatries, wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them, to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you."—From these passages it is evident that christianity changes the heart, and turns it away from sinful gratifications, to the love and service of the Lord. It is also evident from these, and similar passages, that most of the early christians, previous to their conversion, had engaged in these fleshly lusts which destroy the soul ; but after they had received the knowledge of the gospel, they separated themselves from their former associates, denied themselves to their former vices as degrading to their dignity, dishonorable to their God, and altogether contrary to their hopes as christians. They had now come to the true light, which showed them clearly, that their former deeds were indeed evil. But the apostle Paul places the matter in a clear and striking point of view, when he says in 1 Thes. v, 5, 11, "Ye are all the children of the light and the children of the day ; we are not of the night nor of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep as do others, but let us watch and be sober. For they that sleep, sleep in the night, and they that be drunken, are drunken in the night. But let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and for an helmet the hope of salvation." This passage evidently inculcates the great truth, that they who are not in Christ, are walking in the night of moral darkness, and bringing forth the fruits of moral ignorance, and that drunkenness, which is one of the fruits of this ignorance is produced under the shades of moral darkness. But Christ is both the life and the light of men, who lighteneth every man that cometh into the world, for he is the light of the world, and he that followeth him shall

not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. He then who walketh in the light of life and followeth the Lord cannot be a drunkard, which is the fruit of darkness, and an evidence that the individual who is guilty of this vice, is still in darkness, not in the Lord. The tree is known by its fruit, and every good tree bringeth forth good fruit. But christians are engrafted in Christ, who is the true vine, and therefore as a natural consequence, must bring forth good fruit. Every consistent member of the church of Christ, is, through his union with Christ, temperate in all things. The powers of darkness have no longer dominion over him. He walks in the light of life, and naturally and necessarily brings forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness. His sins are pardoned, his soul is sanctified, his desires are purified, his affections are elevated, his faith is strengthened, and his love to God is increased, so that he finds his duty to be his pleasure, and the service of the Lord to be the delight of his soul. Thus escaped from the bondage of sin he enjoys the life that now is, and is permitted to look forward with a well grounded hope of becoming an heir of the life which is to come. Besides all this, christianity is the noblest society that exists on earth, a tree of the Lord's own planting. The same great being, who is Lord over all, God, blessed for ever and ever, is still its living head, and ever ready to crown all its faithful members with the wreath of glory which never fades. The advantages of this society then are not confined to earth and to time, but stretch out to heaven, and embrace eternity.

We trust that christianity has now been shown in a satisfactory manner, to be, in its very essence, in its constitution, in its laws, and in its operations, a temperance society. We trust, also, that it has been clearly proved, that christianity ruling in the heart, not only reforms the

drunkard's exterior deportment, but necessarily eradicates the very desire of drunkenness, by destroying the principle from which it is produced. We trust, also, that we have shown that christianity not only reclaims the drunkard, but converts the sinner from all his degrading vices, and makes him an holy man of God. Thus he, who was once a terror to himself, a burden to society, and a child of the devil, is, through the influence of christianity, made to rejoice with confidence in God his Saviour. Through the same influence he becomes an amiable member of society on earth, and is permitted, through a well-grounded faith, to look forward to the house of God as his home, and to angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, as his companions and fellow-worshippers for eternity. What then would man desire more? Does the purity required in the church of the living God not satisfy your minds?—Is the blood of Christ not pure enough to make you clean? Is the law of God not holy enough to regulate your lives? Are the wells of salvation not capacious enough to satisfy your thirst after righteousness? But, must you still hew out for yourselves cisterns of human invention, that can hold no water, that can give no satisfaction, that can yield no holy fruits, and that can lead to no blessed consequences?

But it must be evident to every one who has ever exercised his reasoning faculties upon this subject, that the system of temperance pursued by the absolutes, although it may make men temperate, in so far as the actual use of alcoholic liquors are concerned, yet still they may love it in their hearts, and therefore be guilty in the sight of Him who tries the heart. Besides, every member of the temperance society may abstain from all intoxicating liquors, yet still they may be guilty of other vices equally offensive

to God, and thereby incur his eternal displeasure. For, although it is said, regarding the law of God, that he who offendeth in one point is guilty of all, yet it is no where said that he who obeyeth in one point is innocent in all. No, the very supposition is directly contrary to the whole tenor of scripture, and an outrage to common sense. To what then does the mighty effort of the absolutes amount? Why, to nothing more than this, that they may persuade men to leave off one species of immorality, without guarding them from running into almost innumerable others, equally fascinating, and equally destructive to their souls. Besides, thousands who know little of the gospel scheme, are induced to believe, that by uniting themselves with the temperance cause, they are safe, they can never fall, that all is well. Is this society not actively engaged in crying, peace, peace, when there is no peace?

The great object, then, of this society, even if it were possible to secure it, to the utmost wishes of its most devoted advocates, would in the end, be found to be as unsatisfactory, as the means employed for its propagation have been shown to be unscriptural. [But what a happy change, through the blessing of God, might soon be effected on the face of the earth, if the same active and persevering efforts, which have been made, and still are making to advance the temperance cause, were turned into another channel, and made to bear directly upon the instruction of the ignorant in the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, and upon the conversion of the sinner from the evil of his ways, and the practice of vice, to the love and the service of the living and the true God.] Then might we hope to see drunkenness with all its kindred vices banished generally from society, and immorality, that many-headed monster retiring as ashamed before the light of the gospel of Christ.

We come now to conclude these lectures, by calling upon you all in the name and by the authority of the great head of the church, the founder of christianity, even in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ the Saviour, to become members without delay of the society which he has established. For there is no other society on earth where you can find peace and safety to your souls. Neither is there any other, the rules of which will lead you directly to cultivate all that is pure, honest, lovely, and of good report, and to abstain from all that is earthly, sensual, devilish. Besides, there is no other society on earth which enjoins upon its members perfect purity in thought, word, and action, neither is there any other whose rules are not only complete but perfect, and whose members are promised divine assistance to enable them to act, and to walk according to its rules, and whose rewards are unfading, and ever satisfying to the most extended capacity of the glorified soul. But having become members of this society, of which the Lord of glory is the head, you are bound by duty, as well as by interest, to abstain from drunkenness, as well as from every other vice. Be entreated also, as you value the hopes and the privileges of christianity yourselves, to use your christian influence, to induce others to enjoy with you the peace and the felicity which are there, and there only to be obtained. By this conduct you will be assisting in forwarding the great work of benevolence and love, which the Saviour came down from heaven to accomplish, and to perfect which he died on Calvary. By engaging in this godlike occupation you become fellow-workers with God, and joint heirs with Christ of the kingdom of heaven. The work then to which you are called is no mean occupation, your fellow-workers are no mean individuals, and the reward is no insignificant recompense. It is only by

christianizing the world that it can be moralized. It is only by diffusing christian knowledge and planting christian principles, that we can overturn the empire of satan, and stem the tide of immorality and vice. A thousand societies of human invention, even by their utmost energy, would fall infinitely short of producing the same blessed results as christianity alone, through the grace of God, is calculated to effect. If we are indeed sincere in our desires to promote the temporal comfort, and the eternal interests of men, let us do so in the way, and by the holy means which God has appointed, and promised to bless, and not by the means which human ignorance and human pride have devised, and which God can never bless, because contrary to his own holy will. Be ready always to say in the language of the holy apostles, to all who would seduce you to observe the traditions and commandments of men, at the expense of setting aside the commandments of the Lord: "We ought to obey God rather than man." Let me entreat you again to be followers of Christ as dear children, and to walk as the ransomed of the Lord, that you may put to silence the ignorance of ungodly men.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

After what has been said in the text, regarding the name of this society, it may appear almost unnecessary to add any thing further on the subject.— But we are not ignorant that error and heresy have often been propagated under the cloak of a specious name, and that, when they have been exposed and condemned, and rendered odious under one name, they have often been taught and practised under some new designation, without any essential variation. The Americans appear, from several passages in the Temperance Volume, from which we have quoted in the text, to claim the honour of inventing the noble system of banishing drunkenness from the earth, by enjoining absolute abstinence from intoxicating liquors upon all the members of their society.

Although we do not envy them the honour of such an invention, yet, we do by no means admit that they are any more than plagiarists even in this favourite scheme. We shall endeavour to trace this scheme from its origin, so that they themselves may know from what family stock they are sprung, and to what honour they are entitled from the christian world. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, vi, 5, that Nicholas, a proselyte of Antioch, was one of the seven deacons chosen by the Apostles. This same Nicholas gave name to a sect of heretics, afterwards condemned by the great Head of the church, as we find in Revelation ii, 6, 15, where it is said to the church of Ephesus, “But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitanes, which I also hate.”— And to the church in Pergamos it is said, “So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, which thing I hate.” Upon this declaration of the Holy Spirit, the name of this sect was soon laid aside, but their heresies were perpetuated by the Gnostics, as may be seen at full length in the writings of St. Irenæus. The Gnostics adopted very austere rules of life, recommended rigorous abstinence, and prescribed severe bodily mortifications.

Again, the Manichean heresy, which is a branch of the Gnostic, prevailed towards the end of the third century. The elect of this sect were bound down to rigorous and entire abstinence from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, *all intoxicating drink*, wedlock, and all amorous gratifications, and to live in a state of the severest penury, nourishing their emaciated bodies with bread, herbs, pulse, and melons, and depriving themselves of all the comforts that arise from the moderate indulgence of animal passions, and, also, from a variety of innocent and agreeable pursuits. Towards the fourth century, the Manicheans assumed various names, which they adopted as a cloak, and abandoned them whenever they were discovered under their new guise.

The Manichean heresy was, in some measure, new modeled in the twelfth century by one Constantine, who then became their great apostle, and seduced vast multitudes to embrace his creed. Constantine was at last stoned to death for his vile and heretical doctrines. This sect prevailed in Bosnia and the neighbouring provinces about the close of the fifteenth century.

The Marcionites, like the Gnostics, were another branch of the Nicolaitanes. The rule of manners observed by this sect of ancient heretics was also extremely severe. They were expressly prohibited wedlock, wine, flesh, and all the external comforts and innocent enjoyments of life. Yet, notwithstanding of these unnatural severities, the sect was, for a time, extremely popular.

We also find the Sembiani, who were another branch of the same family, prohibiting all use of wine among their members, as being the production of satan and the earth, and in its nature only evil, and that continually.

The same heresy has been witnessed under a vast variety of names, and with some shades of difference, in almost every age, from the days of the apostles down to the present time. But no sooner has its origin and tendency been discovered, under any particular name, than it has assumed another designation, and thus continued, for a time, to play its foul game without being suspected, even by those who were supporting the cause.

Among the modern sects of professing christians, previous to the introduction of temperance societies, we are not aware of any who have followed in the direct line of the Nicolaitan heresy through its patriarchs, the Sembiani, Marcionites, Manicheans, and Gnostics, with the exception of the followers of John and Charles Wesley, who, by the rules of their societies, drawn up by these men, and dated the 1st of May, 1743, are prohibited from dealing in, or using spirituous liquors. "It is, therefore," say these wise men, "expected of all who continue therein, (that is in the Methodist Societies) that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, First, by doing no harm, by avoiding evil